The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIV, No. 3 MARCH, 1951

CONTENTS

The Apostolic Constitution *Per annum sacrum* . . . 161

The Instruction of the Sacred Apostolic Paenitentiaria with reference to the Holy Year, 1951 171

Union Perfected: The Assumption of Mary
Thomas U. Mullaney, O.P. 178

The Encyclical *Humani generis* . . . *Gustave Thils* 183

"Church-Goods" Statues and Good Church Statues
Anthony Durand 190

The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation. Part II
Joseph Clifford Fenton 203

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Use of Confessional Knowledge 222

The Right to Pecuniary Offerings 224

Oration for Parents in Requiem Mass 225

Votive Masses 226

Mass Without a Server 226

Distributing Holy Communion 227

Seniority in Receiving Holy Communion 227

Prayer in Putting on a Cassock 228

Requiem Mass Problems 228

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Solemn High Mass Rubric 228

Costume of Domestic Prelates 229

Leonine Prayers After Mass 229

ANALECTA 230

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Philosophy, Vol. II, *by Frederick Copelston, S.J.* 234

"Good Morning, Good People," *by Hyacinth Blocker, O.F.M.* 235

Katholische Dogmatik, Vol. I, *by Michael Schmaus* . . . 236

Roman Collar, *by E. Roberts Moore* 237

BOOK NOTES

A Friendly Easter Thought

What Easier-to-Give and More Valued GIFT To Your Teacher Friends

Than a Subscription to

The Catholic Educational Review

Edited under the direction of the Department of Education, The Catholic University of America, and published monthly from September through June.

Articles on education problems, projects, techniques— Abstracts — News from the educational field — Notes — Book reviews — Covers the elementary, high school, and college levels.

Indexed in The Catholic Periodical Index, The Education Index, and The Guide to Catholic Literature.

No Catholic school, library, rectory, educator, or priest can afford to be without it.

Subscription: **United States, Canada and Foreign $3.50; Single Number 40c**

You are Cordially Invited to Visit our Display (Booth 857) at the National Catholic Education Association 43th Annual Convention in Cleveland March 27, 28, 29 and 30.

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW
Washington 17, D. C.

PER ANNUM SACRUM

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD PIUS XII, BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE, BY WHICH THE UNIVERSAL JUBILEE CELEBRATED IN ROME DURING THE YEAR 1950 IS EXTENDED TO THE CATHOLIC WORLD.

THE BISHOP PIUS
SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD
TO ALL CHRIST'S FAITHFUL
WHO WILL SEE THIS LETTER
GREETING AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION

THROUGHOUT THE HOLY YEAR, which yesterday We closed in this revered city with traditional and solemn rites, uncounted multitudes made their way to Rome in order that, with souls cleansed and purified, they might beg from God pardon for their sins and gain a plenary indulgence for themselves or for the dead. This afforded us great consolation, since We were sure that the Christian renewal of morals which We and all good men desire, and which our times need so badly, would come about from the enkindled zeal for piety wherein the mounting throngs of pilgrims and the populace of Rome vied with each other in glorious rivalry.

Still, not all were able to make the trip to Rome, not only by reason of the economic difficulties that pressed particularly upon the poorer people, not only by reason of old age, infirmities, illnesses, and other causes that stood in their way, but also by reason of the fact that this permission was not granted in several countries because of some special circumstances.

Hence We consider it most expedient to decree, in line with the custom and the tradition of our predecessors, that the Jubilee treasure of mercy, which until yesterday was accessible at Rome, should, during the entire year to come, be made accessible to all Christ's faithful throughout the world. For thus We hope that what We have been most delighted to see flourishing during the past months, like a new springtime of the spiritual life, may not wither away but rather bring forth even richer salutary effects. And We hope that the marvelious expression of Christian faith and piety which all have admired in this holy City may happily be repeated in all cities, towns, and villages.

To bring this about more easily and fittingly, our Venerable Brethren the Bishops and the others who possess ordinary local jurisdiction should see to it that the flocks entrusted to their care are given suitable instruction on this subject and are vehemently urged to take advantage of this great favor. We hope that this will be done especially by means of those sermons delivered to the people and known as "Missions" and by means of spiritual exercises, since we know from experience that this way of teaching God's word is of tremendous value, not only for the elimination of errors and for the accurate explanation of Christian doctrine, but also for bringing about, with the aid of divine grace, a raising up of the souls of those who hear it, recalling them in a salutary way from the consideration of earthly things to those of heaven. It moves them to cleanse themselves of sin and to expiate that sin, and it incites them to enter, with sincere and generous will, upon the arduous path of virtue. Thus it is our hope that, if it be possible, in each individual parish sermons of this kind should be given in a suitable manner during the coming year, in such a way that Christ's faithful may be prepared in all propriety and holiness to obtain the remission of their sins and to win a plenary indulgence of the punishments due to them.

The Prelates should, moreover, remind them to pour forth their

prayers of supplication to God for that same intention which We mentioned in the Apostolic Letter *Iubilaeum maximum*, when We announced the Holy Year to be celebrated in this revered City. They should pray especially that now at last the peace we so hope for may come to the souls of all men, to families, to individual nations, and to the world-wide community of peoples; that those who "suffer persecution for justice' sake" (Mt. 5:10) may have that unconquered courage which has ornamented the Church with the blood of martyrs from the very beginning; that refugees, captives, and those who are exiled far from their own firesides may return very soon to their own dear fatherlands. They should pray also that the hatreds of one class of citizens against another may be extinguished and the quarrels between them terminated so that these classes of citizens may be joined together in justice, in brotherly concord, and in charity; and that the most holy rights of the Church may ever be preserved uninjured and unimpaired against the artifices, the fallacies, and the attacks of its enemies (Cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLI [1949], 259 f.).

So, by the authority of Almighty God, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, by this Apostolic Letter We extend the great Jubilee, which has been celebrated in this holy City, to the entire Catholic world, that is, to the Western as well as to the Eastern Church, and We prolong it to the entire coming year in such a way that people may profit from it from the first vespers of the coming Feast of the Circumcision of Our Lord Jesus Christ until the end of the thirty-first day of December of the coming year 1951.

Wherefore We, by our Apostolic authority, concede and impart to all Christ's faithful, both men and women, who have previously obtained pardon for their sins, a most full indulgence of the entire punishment they are obligated to undergo by reason of the sins they have committed; provided that, having been cleansed by the sacrament of Penance and having received Holy Communion, they religiously and during the assigned times make visits to the churches or public oratories designated for this purpose. This indulgence may be gained even by those who have already obtained the benefit of the Jubilee during the past Holy Year. It may be gained anywhere on earth outside of Rome and its suburbs. The Confession and the Communion prescribed for the gaining of the

Jubilee indulgence must be distinct from the annual confession and the Easter Communion commanded by canon law.

All this must be done in accordance with the norms which follow in this document. An Instruction of the Sacred Apostolic *Paenitentiaria* explains these norms suitably and interprets them authentically.

I. With regard to the making of the Jubilee visitations, those having ordinary local jurisdiction will designate, *in the episcopal city,* the cathedral church and three other churches or public oratories in which the sacrifice of the Mass is offered sometimes at least. In the suburbs and in the other parts of the diocese they will designate the parish church of each parish and, within the boundaries of the parish, three other churches or oratories, as We have said above. The Ordinaries may make such designations themselves or through approved ecclesiastics, to whom, if they wish, they may concede the use of this power throughout the entire year. In the Oriental Church, the Patriarchs and others who have ordinary local jurisdiction should do the same, either by themselves or through ecclesiastics whom they delegate, each for his own eparchy or diocese.

In Missionary lands, however, those having ordinary local jurisdiction are to designate four churches or public oratories in each of their quasi-parochial units or mission stations, in line with the above instruction. No special rules apply to the place where the Ordinary resides, as distinct from the other portions of this mission territory.

II. After the manner of what was done at Rome during the Holy Year just past, so during the coming year one Jubilee visit must be made to each one of the four churches or public oratories designated and they must be made either on the same day or on ensuing days through the year. If in some locality there should not be four churches or public oratories, the Ordinaries will use their own judgment and decide, either themselves directly or through their delegates, that the prescribed four visits may be made to a lesser number of sacred edifices.

Moreover, where this is deemed possible without serious inconvenience, according to the prudent judgment of the Ordinary of the place, it would be quite proper to have one of the prescribed four visits made to the cathedral church or to some other sanctuary designated for this purpose.

III. The prayers to be recited at each visit are these: The "Our Father," the "Hail Mary," and the "Gloria" five times; then the "Our Father," the "Hail Mary," and the "Gloria" once more for our intention; the Apostles' Creed, once; the "Hail Mary" three times, together with the invocation "Queen of Peace, pray for us"; and the "Hail Holy Queen" once. The prayer which We ourselves composed for the Holy Year 1950 may be added to these.

In making their Jubilee visits, the faithful of the Oriental Church must abide by those decrees which our Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church will issue, at the proper time and for each rite, to their Patriarchs and to the rest of those who have ordinary local jurisdiction. Moreover, each of these local Ordinaries is given the authority to substitute other prayers for the ones herein prescribed for the Jubilee visit when such visits are made privately. Likewise the faithful of the Oriental Church who live outside the limits of the territory of this Church may employ the forms of prayer prescribed for the Latins when they join with the pilgrims of the Latin rite. And, when they make these visits as individuals rather than as members of a group, they may use either their own formulae or those prescribed for the faithful of the Latin rite.

IV. So that the faithful may begin and carry out these Jubilee visits more easily, they are hereby empowered to make these visits even outside the limits of their own parish or diocese, as long as they make them in places rightly designated for each place by the person who holds ordinary jurisdiction over that place. The same privilege is given, taking note of their special situation, to those who live in missionary regions.

V. Moreover We decree that, as at Rome during the Holy Year just completed, Christ's faithful may gain this Jubilee indulgence either for themselves or for the dead as many times as they properly complete the prescribed works. No acts, however, can validly be performed for the acquisition of a new Jubilee indulgence before all of those required for the gaining of a previous Jubilee indulgence have been completed.

VI. To take care of the faithful who are placed in special situations, We make the following decrees.

1. Sailors and all others who work on ships can make the Jubilee visits in the chapel of their own vessel, when that vessel

has a chapel in which Mass may be said. If it has not such a chapel, We grant them the privilege of making their Jubilee visits in any church in a port at which they land, when they recite the prescribed prayers.

2. Those having ordinary local jurisdiction can, either by themselves or through ecclesiastics whom they delegate, reduce the number of these visits, or lessen the number of churches that must be visited, or even substitute for the visits other works of piety and charity in keeping with the situation of each individual, in favor of those who are prevented from making these visits in the way in which they are prescribed. It is our desire that among those who are considered as prevented in this way there be numbered nuns, sisters who belong to third orders regular, sisters who belong to religious communities and who live the community life, pious women, girls, and the others who live in homes or refuges for women. We also include hermits who belong to a monastic or regular order and who are devoted to a life of contemplation rather than to one of action, like Trappists or the hermits of the Camaldolese or Carthusian communities, those who are captives or who are detained in prison, and ecclesiastics or religious who are being kept in monasteries or in other religious houses for the purpose of correction. Those who suffer from sickness or infirmity in hospitals and the people who care for them are likewise considered as prevented; so, in general, are all those who by reason of some certainly existent impediment are rendered unable to make the prescribed visits. In the same way we wish to have included in this class workingmen who must earn their daily bread through their own labor and who could not absent themselves from their work for a sufficiently long time, and finally elderly people who have passed their seventieth year.

VII. With regard to the faculties to be given to confessors, who are otherwise approved according to the standards of canon law, which faculties these confessors are to employ in a salutary fashion in hearing Jubilee confessions, we make the following decrees.

1. The confessors have in their entirety all the faculties of absolving, dispensing, and transmuting that they have ever legitimately received from this Apostolic See, whether these faculties are permanent or temporary. They possess them, however, within the limits of the concession itself.

2. Nuns and other women, for the hearing of whose confessions the Code prescribes that a special approval of the Ordinary is required, have the right to choose for themselves any confessor approved by that same Ordinary for the hearing of the confessions of both men and women to hear their own Jubilee confession. We concede to the confessor thus chosen the power to exercise the faculties which he already possesses for all the faithful by reason of this Apostolic Constitution.

3. To all confessors We concede that during the Holy Year they may absolve any penitents, in the internal forum and in the act of sacramental confession and without intermediaries only, from any censures and sins reserved by law to the Roman Pontiff or to the Ordinary and also from a censure imposed by man. The absolution of such censure in the external forum, however, will not be allowed.

VIII. The use of these most generous faculties is permitted only in accordance with the norms and with the exceptions hereinafter enumerated.

1. Except under the circumstances visualized and according to the prescriptions in canon 2254 of the Code of Canon Law, let them not absolve those who are under censure imposed personally by the Roman Pontiff or a censure reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Apostolic See. Likewise let them not absolve those who have fallen under the censure spoken of in canon 2388 §1, the censure reserved to the Holy See according to the ruling of the Decree *Lex sacri coelibatus,* issued by the Sacred Apostolic *Paenitentiaria* on April 8, 1936 (cf. *AAS,* XXVIII, 242) and also according to the ruling of the Declaratio given by the same Sacred *Paenitentiaria* on May 4, 1937 (cf. *AAS,* XXIX, 283). According to the Decree and the Declaratio this censure, in the special case with which we are concerned, is reserved to the Sacred *Paenitentiaria* so that no one can absolve from it at any time except when there is danger of death, even by reason of canon 2254.

2. Likewise they must not absolve, except according to the rule of canon 2254, prelates of the secular clergy who possess ordinary jurisdiction in the external forum, and major superiors of an exempt religious community, when any of these have incurred publicly an excommunication reserved to the Holy See *speciali modo.*

3. They must not absolve heretics or schismatics who have been publicly propounding these aberrations unless these persons abjure their heresy or schism at least in the presence of the confessor, unless they have fittingly made reparation for the scandal they have given or at least have promised to make such reparation fittingly and effectively. Likewise they must not absolve those who find themselves in the circumstances described in the decree of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office on Communism, issued July 1, 1949 (cf. *AAS*, XLI, 334), unless such persons show a sincere and effective repentance.

4. Likewise they must not absolve those who have given their names to forbidden societies, including the Masonic groups and others of the kind, even though these societies be secret, except when those who seek the absolution renounce the forbidden society in the presence of the confessor, make reparation for the scandal they have caused, and stop entirely any active co-operation or favor given to the group with which they were affiliated. Moreover such persons cannot be absolved unless they denounce the ecclesiastics or religious whom they know belong to the forbidden society, according to the prescription of canon 2336 §2; and unless they hand over to the one giving the absolution, to be sent by him carefully and as soon as possible to the Holy Office, the books, manuscripts, and emblems which pertain to the forbidden society and which the persons seeking absolution still retain, or, if there be legitimate and serious reasons militating against this, unless they themselves destroy such objects. At least such persons must sincerely promise to fulfill these conditions imposed as soon as possible and they must promise moreover to do a severe penance in keeping with the magnitude of their fault and to go to confession frequently.

5. Those who have acquired goods or rights belonging to the Church without permission from the Church must not be absolved until they have either restored these properties or acted in accordance with an arrangement obtained from the Ordinary or from the Apostolic See, or at least until they have sincerely promised to seek such an arrangement. This holds true everywhere except in those places which have been provided for otherwise by the Apostolic See.

6. Confessors are empowered, for a legitimate reason, to com-

mute to other pious works all or any *private* vows, even those reserved to the Apostolic See and confirmed by oath. They can likewise, for a serious reason, transmute into other pious works the vow of perfect and perpetual chastity which, although originally made publicly in either a simple or a solemn religious profession, remains in force and entire even when the other vows of the profession have been cancelled by subsequent dispensation. Still they must in no way dispense those who are bound to the law of celibacy by force of sacred orders, even when such persons have been reduced to the lay state. Confessors must refrain from the commutation of vows when such commutation would adversely affect a third person, unless the person so affected freely and explicitly consents to such a commutation. Confessors may not commute the vow of not sinning or other penal vows except in favor of some work which would hold the person back from sin and keep him away from it no less effectively than the vow itself.

7. In the forum of conscience or the sacramental forum alone, they are empowered to dispense from any irregularity that arises from an entirely secret violation of law. Likewise they are empowered to dispense from the irregularity dealt with in canon 985, 4° ; but only to the extent of empowering a penitent to exercise the orders he has already received where there is no danger of disgrace *(infamia)* or scandal. They must, however, impose upon the penitent the obligation of having recourse to the Sacred *Paenitentiaria* within a month's time and of obeying its prescriptions.

8. They are likewise empowered to dispense, in the forum of conscience or the internal forum alone, from the occult impediment of consanguinity in the third or second collateral degree (the sixth or fourth according to the Orientals' method of computing) even touching the first (the fourth or third according to the Orientals), when this is based on illegitimate birth. This dispensation can be used only for the convalidation of a marriage, and never to allow the contracting of such a union.

9. For a marriage which is already contracted or for one which the parties are going to contract, they are empowered to dispense from the occult impediment of *crimen* when neither party has been guilty of plotting. In the case where the union has already been contracted, the confessor must enjoin a renewal

of consent, according to the prescription of canon 1135. In any case the confessor must impose a severe and long penance.

10. With reference to the visits of the four churches, the confessors are empowered to dispense from the visit to any church by commuting this visit to the visit of some other church if this be possible or even by lessening the number of churches which must be visited, and they may exercise this power in favor of those individuals who, for a just cause, are unable to make the visits in the prescribed way. For each individual who is unable, by reason of sickness or some other legitimate impediment, to make the above-mentioned visits to churches, the confessors should commute the obligation of the prescribed visits into an obligation to perform other pious works within the power of these individuals. The confesors, however, should realize that they are burdening their own consciences if they exempt the faithful from such visits lightly and without just cause. Furthermore, they must not allow the persons whom they dispense for a just cause to omit the prayers for our intentions, although, in the case of sick people, they are empowered to lessen the number of these prayers. It must be remembered that these prayers are not bound to the visits to the churches in such a way that when a person is dispensed from the visits, he is excused from offering the prayers.

11. Let the confessors not exempt anyone from the obligation of the prescribed confession, not even those who have not the necessary matter for this confession. The obligation of this confession is not satisfied by an invalid confession or by the annual confession prescribed by Church law.

12. With reference to the prescribed Holy Communion, it is altogether wrong *(nefas)* to substitute any other pious works for this obligation except in the case of those sick people who are utterly unable to receive. It is our wish that Communion which is given as Viaticum can suffice for the Jubilee indulgence, but not the Communion which is prescribed for the Paschal time. The person who has been unfortunate enough to omit his Easter Communion, however, may satisfy both this obligation and that of the Jubilee by a Communion at a later time.

13. Confessors should realize that they can use the above faculties in favor of all the faithful of both the Western and the Eastern Church who come to confession to them with the sincere and firm plan and purpose of gaining the benefit of the Jubilee.

The faculties of absolving from sins and from ecclesiastical censures and likewise the faculty of dispensing from irregularity can only be used once in favor of the same penitent, that is, the first time the penitent avails himself of the Jubilee benefit.

The other faculties, however, including those of lessening the number of visits or of commuting these visits into some other pious works according to what has been said in n. 10, above, can be exercised at any time in favor of the same penitent.

Moreover, if any persons, intending to gain this Jubilee indulgence, begin the prescribed works and then afterwards are prevented by sickness from completing the prescribed visits, We, desirous of favoring them by reason of their pious and eager intention, will to have them considered as actually gaining the abovementioned indulgence as if they had done all the prescribed works, when they have gone to confession and received Holy Communion.

All these things, which We have established and declared in this Apostolic Letter We will to exist and to continue in force and valid to bring the effect of the Jubilee to the entire Catholic world, despite anything to the contrary. We wish to have the same reception given to excerpts and copies of this Letter when they are signed by the hand of a public notary and attested by the seal of an ecclesiastical dignitary, as is given to this letter itself, whenever it is shown or exhibited.

It is forbidden to make any alteration whatsoever in this, our concession, will, and declaration, or to make any rash attempt to contravene it. If any person should attempt such a thing, let him realize that he will incur the wrath of almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the twenty-fifth day of December, on the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year one thousand, nine hundred and fifty, the twelfth year of our Pontificate.

PIUS XII, POPE.

THE SACRED APOSTOLIC PAENITENTIARIA

AN INSTRUCTION

TO ALL PATRIARCHS, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHERS HAVING ORDINARY LOCAL JURISDICTION ABOUT THE JUBILEE YEAR WHICH IS BEING EXTENDED TO THE ENTIRE CATHOLIC WORLD

Since the universal Jubilee which was observed in this revered city is being extended to the entire Catholic world by the Apostolic Constitution *Per annum sacrum* which has just been issued, it is supremely important that the decrees of that Constitution should be followed accurately, prudently, and zealously.

To bring this about more securely and easily, Our Most Holy Father Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope, has commanded this Sacred Apostolic Paenitentiaria to explain clearly and suitably and to interpret authentically those norms contained in that same Apostolic Constitution.

Hence this Instruction is being sent to all the Catholic Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and to all the other prelates endowed with ordinary local jurisdiction, not only so that they may take careful cognizance of all the things herein contained, but also in order that they may prudently and zealously see to it that the clergy and the people entrusted to them, and especially the confessors, abide faithfully by these norms and interpretations.

The following are the special norms and authentic interpretations which are to be followed exactly by all.

I. The faithful who wish to obtain the jubilee indulgence should take cognizance of the fact that they must fulfill those four conditions which are imposed by the decree of the Apostolic Constitution *Per annum sacrum*. They must make a sacramental confession. They must receive Holy Communion. They must make the prescribed visits. During these visits they must say the prescribed prayers.

II. It does not matter whether the Confession and the Communion prescribed for the gaining of the Holy Year indulgence come before the visits to the four churches, or come between the time the visits are begun and the time when they are finished, or come after these visits are finished. The one thing that counts and that is necessary is that the last among the prescribed works, which could be the Holy Communion itself, be performed in the state of grace. Therefore if anyone after having made his confession and before completing the last of the works for the gaining of the indulgence should fall again into mortal sin, he must go to confession again if he has not as yet received Holy Communion. If he has received Communion prior to falling into this sin, he may gain the indulgence by reconciling himself to God through an act of perfect contrition.

III. If it should happen that a person should come to the entrance of a church with the intention of properly making one of the prescribed visits and should find the door closed or that it is impossible to enter the building for any reason, he will fulfill the conditions for the gaining of the indulgence by offering his prayers to God outside the church by the recitation of the prescribed prayers. The visit to the church should, however, be pious and devout, that is, made with the intention of worshipping God and the visible reverence of the one making the visit should manifest this intention.

IV. The prescribed vocal prayers may be recited alternately. The case of persons afflicted with inability to speak properly is taken care of by Canon 936.

V. Confessors should realize and should keep themselves well aware of the fact that they can only use these extraordinary faculties in favor of penitents who come to confession with the idea and with the sincere intention of gaining the benefit of the Jubilee. If, however, the penitent should leave off seeking the Jubilee indulgence and should omit the other works prescribed for the gaining of this indulgence all the absolutions of censures, except those absolutions which were given in such a way that the censure would fall again upon the man who did not fulfill certain conditions, and all the transmutations and dispensations granted to the penitent remain in force.

Confessors can use these faculties even in the extrasacramental internal forum except where there is a question of special faculties for which sacramental confession is expressly required.

Parish priests are given the faculty of dispensing from the Jubilee visits, lessening their number, and commuting them to some other pious work, according to the decree of the Constitution *Per annum sacrum*, VIII, 10. They can exercise these faculties not only in favor of their penitents but also in favor of every individual and every family in their parish.

VI. Since the faculty of absolving from sins and from ecclesiastical censures and likewise of dispensing from irregularity is limited and circumscribed in such a way that it can be exercised in favor of the same penitent only once during the course of the Holy Year, that is, the first time the penitent gains the Jubilee indulgence (Cf. the Constitution *Per annum sacrum*, VIII, 13);

and similarly only when the penitent has not been absolved from these sins and censures or dispensed from an irregularity during the course of the Holy Year by another confessor who has this faculty, it is supremely necessary, for the proper performance of their duty, to inquire of each penitent burdened with these sins, censures, or this irregularity:

1° whether or not he has already gained the Jubilee indulgence of 1951;

2° if he has not gained the indulgence, whether, since the beginning of the Holy Year 1951 he has been absolved from reserved sins or censures or dispensed from irregularity. For if, since January 1, 1951, he has either gained the Jubilee indulgence or has been absolved from sins or from censures or has been dispensed from an irregularity, he cannot again obtain such absolution and dispensation.

VII. Confessors should learn and memorize the list of sins, censures, penalties, and all impediments the absolution or dispensation from which is not included in the faculties granted to them. If such should be encountered, the confessors are to remember that they can only provide for the penitent by faithfully observing the prescriptions of the Code in canons 2254, 2290, and 1045 §3.

VIII. Neither should they fail to give each penitent a salutary penance, even though they rightly believe that the penitent is going to obtain the plenary indulgence of the Jubilee.

IX. If anyone should come under censures not publicly known, but imposed on account of injury done in some way to another party, the confessor should not absolve him until he has given satisfaction either by making amends for the scandal or by undoing the harm caused to the party who was injured. If the penitent is unable to make such satisfaction previously, he must truly and seriously promise to make it as soon as he can.

X. Confessors who have the power to absolve even from public censures must be very sure on this point:

Those upon whom some censure has been imposed *nominatim*, and who are thus publicly manifest, cannot acquire the benefit of the Jubilee until they have legally made satisfaction in the external forum. If however they sincerely put aside their contumacy in the internal forum and show themselves properly disposed, they

can, where the possibility of scandal has been removed, be absolved in the meantime in the internal forum so that they may gain the Jubilee indulgence. They can be absolved, however, only with the obligation of submitting themselves as soon as possible to the external forum to undergo the forms of law.

XI. With reference to the sin which is reserved as a sin, rather than by reason of a censure attached to it, by canon 894, confessors may not absolve from this sin unless the penitent formally retracts the false denunciation and, to the best of his ability, makes reparation for whatever damage that may have followed from it. A serious and long lasting penance must likewise be imposed.

XII. Dealing with the case covered by canon 2342, even where the offence is not publicly known, the confessors must forbid the penitent to go to the religious house or to the church attached to it again, under penalty of having the censure reimposed. The penalties mentioned in canon 2342, 2° remain in force.

XIII. The confessors must not absolve religious who are apostates from their religious community as long as these persons remain outside the cloisters of their community. If, however, these have the firm intention of returning to their religious community, a suitable time should be fixed for carrying out that intention and they may be absolved in the internal forum with the understanding that the censure will be reimposed upon them should they not return to the community within that prescribed time. Moreover these persons should be warned that, as long as they remain outside their community, they are barred from legitimate ecclesiastical acts, they are deprived of all the privileges that belong to their community, they are subject to the Ordinary of the place in which they are, and that, even after they return, they are liable to the other penalties stated in canon 2385. A *religiosus fugitivus*, even though he has fallen under excommunication according to the constitutions of his own community, can, when properly disposed, be absolved in the internal forum. The obligation of returning to their community as soon as possible must be imposed in the same way as in the case of an apostate, and with the same understanding that the censure will fall upon them again should they fail to return. If the person concerned be in sacred orders, he must abide by the suspension described in canon 2386.

XIV. With reference to the commutation of private vows, a

certain wider sense should be understood, so that confessors according to their prudent judgment, may substitute even works which are themselves less meritorious for the vows themselves.

XV. Confessors must never absolve anyone from the sin of reading forbidden books, especially of those which are forbidden under penalty of excommunication in canon 2318, §1, unless before absolution the penitent shall have given over such books to the Ordinary, or to the confessor himself, or to another person who has the permission to retain them, or at least unless he has seriously promised to destroy those books or to hand them over as soon as possible.

XVI. With reference to the faculty of commuting or dispensing from the Holy Year visits to churches, the following points are to be remembered.

1° When anyone has obtained a dispensation with regard to one or another of the churches or public oratories, and when no obligation to visit another church or oratory has been imposed by way of commutation, he should understand that the four visits must still be made and that these must be made in the other churches or oratories. Thus the faithful, immediately after leaving a church or oratory at the end of one visit, can return to it again to make another visit. The dispensation from visiting a certain church is not the same as a lessening of the number of visits which must be made.

2° If anyone should ask for, not only a dispensation from visiting a certain church, but also a reduction in the number of the visits themselves, the confessors should prescribe the recitation of a number of prayers in some way equal to the number of visits from which the penitent has been dispensed. These prayers should be similar to the ones prescribed for the visits.

3° With reference to the dispensations and commutations mentioned above, the confessors should realize that they are burdening their own consciences if they grant these to the faithful lightly and without a just cause.

XVII. Since the visitation of the four churches is not a work obligatory on its own account, but only something imposed upon those who freely wish to gain the indulgence of the Jubilee, the confessors who are privileged for a reasonable cause to dispense from this obligation in whole or in part should not substitute for

it other works which the penitent is strictly obligated to perform on some other grounds.

Our most Holy Father Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope, has ordered this Instruction to be published so that there may be available to all a constant and safe interpretation of the faculties which will exist and of the works which must be accomplished for the gaining of the Jubilee indulgence during the course of the coming Holy Year, extended to the entire world.

Given at Rome, from the office of the Sacred Paenitentiaria, on the twenty-sixth day of December, 1950.

/s/ N. Cardinal Canali
Paenitentiarius Maior
/s/ S. Luzio, *Regent.*

L. S.

Mary and the Priest

When you meet very serious difficulties in the path of holiness and the exercise of your ministry, turn your eyes and your mind trustfully to her who is the Mother of the Eternal Priest and therefore the loving Mother of all Catholic priests. You are well aware of the goodness of this Mother. In many regions you have been the humble instruments of the mercy of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in wonderfully reviving the faith and charity of the Christian people.

Our Lady loves everyone with a most tender love, but She has a particular predilection for priests who are the living image of Jesus Christ. Take comfort in the thought of the love of the Divine Mother for each of you, and you will find the labors of your sanctification and priestly ministry much easier.

To the Beloved Mother of God, mediatrix of heavenly graces, We entrust the priests of the whole world in order that, through her intercession, God will vouchsafe a general outpouring of His Spirit which will move all ministers of the altar to holiness and, through their ministry, will spiritually renew the face of the earth.

—Pope Pius XII in his exhortation *Menti nostrae*, issued on Sept. 23, 1950. The translation is from p. 46 of the *NCWC* edition.

UNION PERFECTED: THE ASSUMPTION OF MARY

"O Immaculate Virgin, Mother of God and mother of men: we believe with all the fervor of our faith in your triumphal Assumption both in body and soul into Heaven, where you are acclaimed as Queen by all the choirs of Angels, and all the legions of the Saints."

These words, written by our Holy Father for the occasion of the definition of Our Lady's Assumption, are a sign that the work of many generations is completed, the prayer of uncounted souls answered, the most eager desire of God's Church fulfilled. Now at last the discussions are over, the investigations ended. Now at last faith has its hour: for now faith, faith and love together, come to rest in explicit embrace of God's revealed truth. All else is done: all that remains is for faith, enlightened by divine wisdom and understanding, to penetrate and taste something of the glory of this divine truth of Mary's Assumption into heaven.

To know something of the grandeur, something of the mystery of the holy Virgin's Assumption we must contemplate what that Assumption is in Mary, what it means in the mystery of her union with her God.

In Mary's loving union with her God we can distinguish three phases, three moments, so to say: and in each her love has a distinctive character, renders to God a unique service. To each of these corresponds some special aspect of the Assumption: and always each aspect is Christ's boundless return of love to Mary for what she had rendered to Him. The three phases of Mary's union with the Saviour, and service to Him, are: first, the moment of the Incarnation; second, the prolonged moment of their intimate union in the family life at Nazareth: and third, the tragic moment of Mary's eager union with the saving Passion of her Son.

At the moment of the Incarnation, at that moment when to Gabriel and to God the holy Virgin uttered her glorious answer "Be it done unto me according to thy word" the living Word of the Eternal Father entered into the womb of the most chaste Virgin. At that instant the Son of God became, as it were, clothed with human nature, clothed with the very flesh of the Virgin.

She alone was privileged to give to God's own Son a body—a body of the very substance of her own sinless body. That body of His was fashioned, even in appearance, no doubt, after the likeness of her own. She alone was to Him a human parent, so surely it is credible that He resembled her.

See then how perfectly Our Lady's Assumption is Christ's extravagant return to Mary of her love of that moment. She had given to Him a body, she had co-operated in clothing Him with human nature. By the Assumption Christ returns to her, glorified now a thousandfold, what she had given Him. His Body had come forth from hers, had been like unto hers; now through His power her body returns to her soul, her body made now after the likeness of His glorified Body. He had been like her physically: in return He makes her like Him beatifically. As by the Incarnation the Son had been like the Mother, so now by her Assumption, the Mother is like unto the Son. He, as to His Body, was of the Virgin; now she, as to the glory of her body, is of Him: for in her Assumption all proceeds from Christ, all is modelled on Christ.[1] At the Incarnation she became the living tabernacle of God; now by the Assumption she is His perfect Temple, His everlasting dwelling-place.[2]

Mary's love of Christ, her oneness with Him does not end at the Incarnation; it merely begins there. Each successive day, at each passing hour, that union was intensified, deepened, as Mary gave herself ever more completely to the service of her divine Son. In those quiet years of Nazareth, an intimacy, a community of mind and heart and will flourished between them—a common life of ineffable perfection. Mary's every plan, every action was in the service of Christ, her God: her heart and all her being centered there in Him so that His will became, as it were, her will, His mind and life, her mind, her whole life.

What of Mary's Assumption into heaven—does it not imply between Christ and Mary a new common life of such love and intimacy that that of Nazareth becomes by comparison, a mere foreshadowing? The common life they now share is not merely human: it is a common beatific life, derived even into their bodies.

[1] Cf. Pseudo Augustine, *Liber de assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis* (*MPL*, XL, 1141-48).

[2] Cf. St. John Damascene (*MPG*, XCVI, 716 ff.).

At this moment, in the case of each of them, each glance, each motion, each bodily action is directly and totally God-centered—an explicit act of love of God. Between them there flowers now the uniquely perfect human community: a oneness, in the love of God, a oneness of mind and heart, of soul and bodily activity that is ultimate, complete. This is the return from Christ for Mary's single-hearted devotion to Him. In return for that there flows to her now, from Christ, a perfection of life and light and love which founds this community of blessedness. The Assumption is but the special working out, in Mary, of Christ's promise "Where I am there also shall my minister be."[3] Mary had ministered to His as no other ever could: therefore His return of love reached out to take her to Himself before the time set for common men.

Finally, in the mystery of the Virgin's oneness with the Lord, that oneness which is eternally perfected in the Assumption, we must look to her on Calvary. There she rendered to Christ a love, a giving of herself, that is beyond description. He had been lashed with whips, pierced with nails, suspended from the Cross: "there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother."[4] She, too, had been lashed—lashed with the whips of sorrow. She, too, was pierced—pierced with the sword foretold in the words of Simeon. With her broken heart she concurred eagerly in her Son's supreme sacrifice. In the hour in which He was the Man of Sorrow she was *par excellence* the Sorrowful Mother.

Christ's agony was His victory: by it He merited His exaltation. As Our Lady was associate of the one, so also of the other. Should not she who had partaken of His hour of darkness partake also of His eternity of light? The eyes that looked upon the stained, distorted face of Christ upon His Cross look now forever upon the beauty of His glorious countenance. The heart that once beat fast in anguish beats now in ecstasy of everlasting joy. As the Virgin Mother of Sorrows had been faithful unto Christ in agony—so the zealous, overpowering love of that same Christ has reached out to catch up into His exaltation even her body. From Him there had once descended upon her the silent mantle of sorrow: now in return she is forever more the "woman clothed

[3] *John* 12:26. Cf. Pseudo Augustine, *loc. cit.*

[4] *John* 19:25.

with the sun."[5] Forever more she is vested in the light and warmth of that "Sun of Justice" who is her own Divine Son: she, the very throne of God, is clothed with something of the glory that He had before the world was.[6]

The hour of the Holy Virgin's Assumption is the hour of her glorification: it is the hour of Christ's return of love. But the glory of the Mother of Christ, the glory of this citadel of God, is not for her alone. The Assumption is proof of God's love for her, yes; but proof, too, of His love for us. In her we triumph; her glory is the cause of our joy. By the unutterable goodness of God she is Mother of Christ—but she is also Mother of Men. As any true mother would, she seeks to share with us, her children, the wealth heaped up for her by God's lavish love. Mary's heart burns at this moment to make each of us a sharer in her glory, a companion in her love of God. She did not bear Christ for herself alone, but for us also: she did not suffer with Him for herself, but for us: neither does she triumph alone. Her triumph is ours, for in God's everlasting plan she is inseparable from all who are destined to be sons of God in glory. This Assumption, this effect of God's merciful love which is, in the Holy Virgin, accomplished, is in us by promise.

As our eyes look up to that vision of the "woman clothed with the sun" our hearts beat with vibrant hope—hope that what God has wrought in one of our race, and she our Mother—He shall achieve even in us.

It would be impossible to indicate here the full import on our lives of the divinely revealed truth of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin. But this much we must see. By the solemn definition of the Assumption, faith—enlightened, warmed, revivified by this ray of Divine truth—must grow strong. Hope, reassured, enlivened by this vision of accomplishment must be rekindled, must reach out, eagerly feeding upon this proof of God's benevolent omnipotence. Most of all love, love of God's goodness so manifest in Mary, and in us, sings out in ecstasy of thanks and worship: and then grows silent, like Mary, in love's long gaze of contemplation.

Especially for us who live at this hour of history must this dogmatic definition be fruitful. It is no accident, in the providence

[5] *Apoc.* 12:1. [6] Cf. *John* 17:5.

of God, that this definition has been delayed until this day: it is no accident that it comes at this moment. Our need of this assurance, our need of Mary Assumed, could hardly be greater than it is. Our disintegrating culture is in opposition to almost all the implications of Mary's bodily Assumption. For our age is characterized by two marks especially: cruelty and carnality. We, so close to our own times, can hardly measure their barbarity: none the less, the last thirty-five years of our history have encompassed more of brutality and of flagrant sensuality than untold centuries of preceding Christian history. One indication is the situation of God's Church today. Never in all her long history, not even in the days of Roman persecution, has the Church been tortured as at this hour.

We, we too, are in danger of infection from our own environment. So God has decreed for our hour this solemn definition, that by it our hearts might be raised up from the sensual shambles of our earth to that vision of true nobility. Mind and heart are warmed, encouraged by the reality and the closeness of such true human glory. The virtues which the Church of God most needs in this day of sorrow, are *bravery* against the barbarity of the ever-encroaching enemy who has already torn whole peoples from the Church; and *temperance* against the subtle appeal of sensuality. Look now to the "woman clothed with the sun." Her very body is a sanctuary of these virtues—for are they not *bodily* virtues, rooted in bodily appetites? Are not these virtues, then, glorified in her Assumed body? At this hour Mary pleads before Christ that we may share in Christian strength and Christian temperance; pleads that in us individually the Church of God may find those athletes of Christ, those champions of the Faith which the Church has nurtured us to be. Mary's bodily Assumption is more than an inspiration, more than encouragement: it is an instrument in our sanctification, an instrument in the fulfilling of our vocation.

THOMAS U. MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

THE ENCYCLICAL *HUMANI GENERIS*

For quite some time there was talk that the Holy Father, or at least the Roman curia, would intervene in the case of certain tendencies in the field of theology and even with reference to some tendencies in the field of philosophy. People spoke of putting things on the Index and of condemnations. At last we received correct information. The Sovereign Pontiff, on August 12 of last year, published a new encyclical on contemporary theological problems.

The encyclical is so compact and rich, so delicately shaded and prudently elaborated, that its meaning cannot be set down in any brief formula. All the faithful, and in any event all priests in charge of souls, ought to read it and to reflect upon it calmly and dispassionately. The Sovereign Pontiff treats of numerous theological and philosophical problems which, by reason of their very complexity, run the risk of being misunderstood, to the serious harm of those who are subjected to the consequences of conclusions and solutions that are given without due deliberation.

We note, among the matters touched upon in the pontifical document, the doctrine of evolution, at least that which rejects "all that is absolute, certain, and unchangeable"; the false historicism which is concerned "only with the events of human life"; a "return to the sources," which is ill-conceived and which is contemptuous both of human reason and of the Church's teaching office; dogmatic relativism, in terms of which it would be "absolutely necessary that theology, according to the different philosophies which, over the course of time it employs as instruments, should substitute new concepts for old ones so that it would express in a human manner the same divine truths in ways that are different, and even, from a certain point of view, mutually opposed, but which would be, as they say, equivalent."

A certain number of questions have to do with the interpretation of Scripture.

There are some who boldly pervert the meaning of the Vatican Council's definition that designates God as the Author of Sacred Scripture, and they put forward again the opinion, already often condemned, which asserts that immunity from error extends only to those parts of the Bible that treat of God or of moral and religious matters. Moreover, they speak in a completely inaccurate manner of a human sense of the

Scriptures, beneath which a divine sense, which they say is the only infallible meaning, lies hidden. In interpreting Scripture, they will take no account of the analogy of faith and the tradition of the Church. . . . Further, according to their fictitious opinions, the literal sense of Holy Scripture and its explanation, carefully worked out under the Church's vigilance by so many great exegetes, should yield to a new exegesis, called symbolic or spiritual. . . . By this method, they say, all difficulties vanish, difficulties which hinder only those who adhere to the literal meaning of the Scriptures.

In the field of dogma itself, the Encyclical mentions an imposing number of errors, which it merely indicates in a word or in a phrase.

It is now doubted that human reason, without divine revelation and the help of divine grace, can, by arguments drawn from created things, demonstrate the existence of a personal God. It is denied that the world had a beginning. It is argued that the creation of the world was necessary, since it proceeds from the necessary liberality of divine love. It is denied that God has eternal and infallible foreknowledge of the free actions of men. . . . Some also question whether the angels are personal beings, and whether matter and spirit differ essentially. Others destroy the true gratuity of the supernatural order, since God, they say, cannot create intellectual beings without ordering and calling them to the Beatific Vision. . . . Disregarding the definitions of the Council of Trent, some pervert the very concept of original sin, along with the concept of sin in general, as an offense against God, as well as the idea of the satisfaction performed for us by Christ. Some even say that the doctrine of transubstantiation, being based on an antiquated notion of substance, should be so modified that the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist be reduced to a kind of symbolism, whereby the consecrated species would be merely efficacious signs of the spiritual presence of Christ and of His intimate union with the faithful members of His Mystical Body. Some say that they are not bound by the doctrine . . . which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation. Others, finally, belittle the reasonable character of the credibility of the Christian faith.

Thus we see that in various sections of dogmatic theology points have been singled out and teachings censured.

Then, passing to the domain of the positive sciences, the Holy Father reminds us of certain general principles that concern evolu-

tion. He rejects polygenism as something incompatible with what revelation and the Church's doctrinal authority teach on the subject of original sin. He reproves an over-liberal interpretation of the historical value of the first chapters of Genesis.

* * * * *

The Encyclical is firm and moderate. It has had many commentaries already, and it bids fair to have many more. In Europe we may remark the explanations offered in the *Revue thomiste,* the *Nouvelle revue theologique, Etudes,* and the *Civiltà cattolica.* It has likewise occasioned a good deal of gossip.

As far as I know, no book has been put on the Index. No name has been cited or mentioned directly. On the other hand, some of the professors in one faculty of sacred theology have been assigned to other fields of priestly activity. Despite the fact that people avoid mentioning particular names and written works in order not to be "more Catholic than the Pope," the outstanding proponents of the tendencies denounced by the encyclical are perfectly well known.

There are certain severe statements in the encyclical. These reproaches are definitely not directed towards the great body of Catholic teachers and theologians. The Holy Father himself has told us as much.

There were, however, a certain number of people, even ecclesiastics, who showed a serious lack of common sense in their presentation and propagation of some opinions that were novel and that lacked adequate proof, and which may have been inexact. I am acquainted with one such cleric, a man who exercises his priestly ministry in great part among university students of all kinds. He seemed convinced that he had been in some way commissioned to expound to these university students certain of the most advanced and most astonishing opinions, as if these constituted a new and definitive revelation. The theologians themselves preferred to reserve discussion of these opinions to gatherings of specialists and to a professional milieu.

The cleric to whom I refer seemed to imagine that his "commission" exempted him from any outward control. As for the young intellectuals: they would have been better off if they had been given as a teacher some priest who, besides being well aware

of contemporary tendencies, would have had an enlightened judgment, a solid personal maturity, and strong dogmatic positions.

In judging about persons, however, it is best to hold to the attitude manifested by Fr. Labourdette. Here is how he introduces his commentary on the pontifical document.

> The encyclical *Humani generis* is a document of major importance. It demands the filial adherence of all, but it also calls for reflection on the part of theologians. It brings them practical directives which, in very serious terms, demand their obedience. At the same time, it brings them a certain number of teachings which the Sovereign Pontiff expressly wills to place outside the sphere of discussion. Some of these teachings are presented in the form of condemnations. It will be the business of future historians of dogma and of theology to attach to these tendencies the names of books and of writers who have been envisioned in the condemnation and affected by the tendencies. In the absence of any such designation of persons, it is impossible to attribute these teachings to definite men and writings as yet without running the risk of grave injustice, of harming the reputations of Catholic theologians and philosophers who are entirely submissive and devoted to the Church, and of doing this by hearsay, by suspicion, and by dishonest insinuations.

It would not be at all honest to exaggerate the coverage of the Encyclical at the expense of people who, though they may have made some mistakes in certain fields (mistakes which, incidentally must be considered individually, and not lumped together *in globo*), have not allowed these mistakes to affect all the other portions of their lives and their writings. Just because a theologian has made a mistake in one of his books or in resolving one of the problems he has taken up is no reason why he should be considered as unorthodox for the rest of his life or why all his writings should be considered suspect.

Unfortunately, we sometimes find seminarians and even other clerics acting on exactly the contrary assumption. On encountering some individual whom they have hitherto known only as the proponent of some error refuted in the class of dogmatic theology, they are completely astonished to find that he is a good priest, devout and loyal to the Church, despite the doctrinal aberration of which he was once guilty.

From the beginning to the end of the encyclical, the Sovereign Pontiff has made every effort to prevent such excesses. Speaking

of those who have made mistakes, he takes cognizance of their zeal and their desire to serve both the Church and the cause of science even when he is pointing to their imprudence and their lack of insight. He knows very well that "the majority of Catholic teachers who serve in universities, seminaries and colleges in charge of religious institutions are far removed from these errors." Categorically he offers encouragement to those who devote themselves to research. These are his words.

> Let them strive with all their strength to contribute to the progress of those sciences which they teach, but let them also take care not to pass beyond the limits We have set for the protection of the truths of the faith and of Catholic doctrine. In new questions, rendered actual by modern culture and progress, let them engage in most diligent works of research, but with fitting prudence and circumspection.

Those who, in the course of such scholarly labors, have made mistakes, ought then to submit with filial sincerity to the Holy Father's directives. And, by the same token, those who have never made mistakes because they have never engaged in scholarly research should also heed the Holy Father's exhortations.

* * * * *

So much for the question of the persons affected by the encyclical. Now we may ask: what about the doctrines themselves? These teachings seem to have arisen because of the fact that the traditional Christian thought finds itself in the presence of a profane world—with the sciences, with history, and with philosophy, where there is constant development. This presence brings with it necessarily certain interrelations. Now it is possible to think of these relations as involving mere juxtaposition and, if this view be justified, there is no such thing as a disquieting problem, there is no initiative we must take, there is no work of research to which we must look forward. Again, it is possible to think of the relations between the traditional Catholic thought and the modern intellectual world as involving real contacts. But then there is the question: how are these contacts going to be made? If this supposition be true, then actual questions arise. There are certain initiatives we must take. History can throw some light on this point.

We know through history that at the beginning of this century certain men whom we know as "Modernists" proposed a certain formula of contact which, in the last analysis, was worse than a

mere compromise. Their attempted solution offered no real contact whatsoever, since it ended up in denying one of the values under consideration. A true contact, on the other hand, should maintain in their authentic purity both the truth of Catholic thought and the contributions of modern knowledge.

Should we call the errors reproved in the *Humani generis* by the name of Modernism? The Encyclical itself does not adopt this course, and it seems best for us to follow its example. The errors condemned in that document bear little resemblance to those of the Modernists. Those who are even slightly acquainted with the literature which the Modernists produced during the first decade of this century and who have come into contact with their teachings and their philosophy as it actually existed and not merely as it is described in textbooks, will not speak of "Modernism" here.

We must, however, go beyond this. Modernism itself arose by reason of the undeniable fact that Christian thought confronts profane thought in the world. And, although the solution of the Modernists was false and worse than maladroit, the problem itself remains. An unfortunate attempt at solution has been made. That attempt deserves condemnation. The problem itself, however, is always with us. It is our business to bring a solution to that problem. Christians have enough faith to believe that there is only one ultimate Truth, and that, as a result, there can be no real opposition between truths certainly acquired in modern science and the certain truths of Catholic doctrine. They will not allow themselves to be persuaded, then, that a mere juxtaposition of these two groups of truths can be sufficient. They are certain *a priori* that a genuine contact is possible, and that such a contact would be a good thing. Certain attempts in this direction are difficult and troublesome. Others have been imprudent and have been really regrettable. Such, it would seem is the profound meaning behind the appearance of this whirlpool of temerarious hypotheses that arose towards the middle of our century and which have been rejected in the *Humani generis.*

Ultimately, we ought to be glad that some progress has been made. There is now a better actual contact between Christian thought and profane thought, despite the ever-growing complexity of the latter. The Modernist error has passed away. There are, however, some radically different new errors.

We have no business blackening the situation of Catholic theology under pretext of maintaining its orthodoxy. The Holy Father has given us all the proper orientation. He has warned those devoted to research to keep their works within the proper perspective. He has called upon theologians to take up the important task of making our eminently traditional truth live in a world that is rich in constant development.

GUSTAVE THILS

The Catholic University of Louvain
Louvain, Belgium.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1901, is entitled "Lord Russell of Killowen." It is contributed by Fr. M. Russell, S.J., brother of Lord Russell, and is a brief account of the life of the distinguished Irish Catholic who became Lord Chief Justice of England. . . . In his solution to a case concerning the administration of the sacraments to the dying, Fr. Lehmkuhl, S.J., follows the opinion that if a person whose religious beliefs and affiliation are entirely unknown is dying unconscious, he may not be baptized, even conditionally, unless there is some positive indication that he is unbaptized and desires baptism. . . . Fr. H. T. Henry contributes a translation of a medieval hymn on the Passion of Christ. . . . "Christian Asceticism and Common Sense," from the pen of Fr. H. Lucas, S.J., is a defense of the traditional doctrine of the spiritual value of self-denial against the theory that keeping oneself physically fit by exercise and temperance is just as virtuous as the austerities commended by ascetical writers. . . . In the *Analecta* we find the Encyclical *Graves de communi*, in which Pope Leo XIII discusses various social questions, especially the nature of Christian democracy. The letter contains the significant statement: "Justice and charity, joined together, by the fair and moderate law of Christ uphold the framework of human society and lead the individual members to their own and to the common good." . . . Fr. J. Power recommends the manufacture of altar wine by priests themselves, and explains the process. . . . A correspondent suggests that disinfectant be put in the holy water fonts, but receives the answer that this is not necessary if pastors observe the prescriptions of the Church which require the fonts to be kept clean and the water to be renewed frequently.

F. J. C.

"CHURCH-GOODS" STATUES AND GOOD CHURCH STATUES

Among my friends there is a typical parish priest. It is curious what inexhaustible satisfaction he derives from one unvarying theme of conversation: the impractical and theorising tendencies of seminary professors (I am one, you see), as contrasted with the hard-headed effectiveness of men whose characters are moulded by contact with parish problems. It is to be feared that these pages will do no more than stoke his fires and set the wheels of his mental and conversational machinery turning more noisily and monotonously than ever; but a train of thought has been forming in my mind which demands to be expressed, and the fact is that the incident which set me going occurred during a visit to the actual parish in which this friend of mine daily has his character moulded into that hard-headed effectiveness he so much esteems.

He was building a school. In the corridor of this school there was to be a niche, and in this niche a statue. A wealthy lady of the environs had promised to donate the statue in due course and, upon the particular Sunday morning I have in mind, she came into the sacristy to confer with him about it. Obviously as good and simple as she was plump, she began in great delight to tell us all about an image she had seen in a store, just the right size and simply lovely. I paid little heed until she mentioned that it had real glass eyes and that they seem to look at you just as if it were really alive, Father. Then the vision of that host of dreary plaster figures, in their dreary insignificance, which have afflicted the Church in our part of the world; the problem of what was the matter with them; and the question of what on earth could be done about it, all returned wearily to mind. I experienced a sense of helplessness, which was normal; and of inarticulateness, which was intolerable. Realizing that a protest would get nowhere, since I had no arguments with which to back it, I nevertheless uttered one now against the glass eyes. My friend, the parish priest, although it was plain that these objects did not rouse in him the dyspeptic disturbance which they were generating in me, listened with the air of a man who was vaguely aware that they might well be a mistake and who was ready to be convinced of it. The prospective donor appeared grieved at

my criticisms, but docile. But my feeble attempt to offer rational grounds for my objections soon broke down. It seemed as if there ought to be no difficulty in finding a number of crushing arguments in my favour, but no amount of groping brought them to light. I was sure that glass eyes on a statue were somehow or other a last straw, an ultimate in a process of artistic reasoning which had got off on the wrong foot at its beginning; but it was beyond me to see or tell what was the matter just at that moment. Neither the plump lady's respectful silence nor the pastor's air of tolerance helped to provide any inspiration.

The fact is that to show what is wrong with those glass eyes is not as easy as I used to think; and the amount of discussion required may seem suspiciously large to those who are impatient of theorising. But principles must go before practice; a false principle has led to poor religious art in such statues as that which perhaps at this moment fixes with its vitreous stare the little pupils of my friend's parish school; a true principle could lead to images more worthy of our grand traditions of liturgical beauty, and more capable of arousing thoughts and emotions of the kind which the liturgy exists to generate. However much he may now seem to depart into the domain of theory, this professor refuses to grant that his aim is anything but practical. From the parish priests among his readers he humbly begs forgiveness for the sardonic remarks of his first paragraph—a worm must not miss his chance of turning—and urges them to think that this subject is a grave one, even though it may not be receiving a very grave presentation. If we had the right sort of religious art to help us, we could be attracting and holding souls to Christ far more effectively than is possible with the wrong sort.

Let us begin by examining what has been called above a false principle of art criticism, the principle which flowers in so many gaudily-tinted plaster effigies and bears, as its dreadful fruit, those unutterable glass eyes. An objection commonly heard against certain images, whether carved or on canvas, is that they do not appear lifelike. "Surely the Blessed Virgin never looked like that!" is what people will say when confronted by some particular image of her; and they are expressing dissatisfaction. Now, what such a protest implies is that the aim of a good work of art should be to copy life, so as to draw as near as possible to a result

which will be indistinguishable from reality. This is the principle I have called false and which need only be followed a little distance towards its logical consequences to make its falseness and absurdity manifest.

Suppose we set about designing an ideal statue of the Virgin in accordance with the principle just mentioned. The first question to be settled concerning our figure will be that of size; but its solution is easy for, according to the rule we are accepting, the best size must obviously be life-size. As to outline, we shall again be obliged to reproduce the normal proportions of woman as accurately as possible. As to color, an image of a uniform white or stone-color could not possibly duplicate life like a tinted one, so that our production must be painted, and painted as realistically as possible. Next come the glass eyes (not so much of a final horror as I had thought), which are clearly a vast improvement over mere carved or painted orbs. But it is manifest also that a real robe of blue silk or linen will represent far better what Our Lady actually wore than anything copied in paint, so that we will now be forced to call in the sisters to design a gown and headdress. Next a wig of genuine human hair—and now what can stop us?

But why not avoid all this bother and simply hire Peggy McGillicuddy, the charming president of the young ladies' sodality, to take a suitable costume and stand on a pedestal over Our Lady's altar with her eyes cast up to heaven, whenever we require a really superlative image of the Blessed Mother? There would be drawbacks of course: the honour granted her might arouse a little ill-feeling among the other girls; or it might be just our luck that she would have the sniffles on the evening we needed her.

Do not be too quick to accuse the writer of irreverence. The truth is that many statues of the Blessed Virgin now standing in our churches are irreverent, and it is that irreverence we are trying to expose. An excessively naturalistic image of the Mother of God does her an injury; it is a carved and painted denial of the truth that her significance for us is supremely spiritual.

We should be a litttle cautious, therefore, in dismissing religious statues or pictures, for the reason that they obviously do not represent what the original personages may have looked like in the flesh. And it may be added that no good artist has ever thought

his images should duplicate reality in this way. The purpose of an image is never to give us life over again, so to speak, but rather to give us something better—better for us, at any rate. We go into a church to pray, because there is too much noise, bustle, and bewilderment in the streets. We are determined to escape the bill-boards, the shop-windows, the theatre signs, all the sales-talk and propaganda of the world, the flesh, and the devil. A church is built in a particular way and decorated in a particular way in order to offer a background for prayer which shall be harmonious and symbolic, and hence will show none of the confusion, worldliness, and distraction of the streets. Now the same principle which governs the building and decorating of churches must also govern the designing of the images to be placed in them. If a picture or statue is to be of any spiritual use or beauty, it must have less of the complexity, less of the multifarious detail, less of the distracting and excessive sense-appeal, which life has; and it must, above all, have a meaning more impressive and evident than that which any object taken from life can ever reveal to us.

So far we have been attacking a popular heresy about objects of art, one which is easy to fall into for the reason that it is not so much a downright error as an erroneous exaggeration of a true aspect of the question. As usual the whole truth will be attained when an equilibrium is attained and the extremes are balanced. Let us see now if we can determine what are the principles which constitute these extremes, and what is the role of each in a genuine work of art. There will be a better hope of success in our investigation if we cease to draw our examples from religious art, because the subject matter in this case is beyond our reach in the world of the spirit. It will be easier and clearer to do our speculating about images which are of objects in this world, familiar to our daily experience.

One of these objects, only too familiar, is Mr. Joseph Stalin. His features we know, I suppose, as well as we know our own. Yet all that multitude of photographs of this gentleman that we have seen leave us dissatisfied; none of them reveals their man. It is not that they fail as good likenesses. And if that were the trouble, we could go to Madame Tussaud's and enjoy the sight of a wax model of our friend, life-size, and accurate to the last hair

of his mustache. It would do no good; and we know it. What I am trying to say is that what we want is a portrait, and that portraits are not painted in order to give their beholder the impression that the sitter is before him in the flesh, but rather to convey the character, temperament and motives of their subject. Our minds unconsciously demand a picture of Stalin that will help us to understand him, and to understand him as he really is. Give us an artist capable of such a work and we should not care if he made one eye blue and the other brown. Here is the first of the two principles described above as extremes between which it would be necessary to strike a balance: the good image cannot be a faithful copy because it must have a meaning, and that is something the faithful copy never has. That is why our elaborate likeness of the Blessed Virgin with its real wig and glass eyes would never do; it could tell us nothing about her, and might only annoy us or make us idly interested or curious by its ingenuity. To achieve significance and power, an artist is positively obliged to avoid absolute fidelity to the real.

But if all we desire is the significance of a man like Stalin, if all we require is a clear analysis of his aims and policies, why not read the history books? Or why not study the doctrines of Lenin and Marx? The answer, quite seriously, is that, first, it would be dry work; and secondly, that there are things about a character no biographical or philosophical work can convey.

That philosophical or scientific investigation is dry work, we all have learned to our cost; it is not natural or easy for man to disregard the concrete, sensuous side of things and to deal with them only in the abstract. Images have always a sensuous side, and that is half the secret of their charm. For the child it is almost impossible to learn or remember anything except by the use of images; nor does the most advanced scientist or scholar ever rise to a condition where diagrams, charts and so forth are no longer of any advantage. What good art is trying to achieve is an image so perfectly made that we shall be able to think out its meaning without realizing that we are doing it. It is that direct, delightful apprehension, that swift and pleasant mode of learning, which truly explains the special satisfaction which is afforded by works of art.

Second, there are aspects of real life which no amount of

scientific investigation can discover or explain; things as impossible to communicate as a given taste or smell. All anybody can do with an impression of this kind is to tell what it is like; that is, liken it to something, find an image for it. In regard to this matter of portraits, for example, have we not all had the experience of rejecting, one after the other, a series of snapshots of a friend, until we happened on one which we could see at a glance had really caught the man as we knew him? Is it not true that, in most instances, we could give no explanation for our choice? A certain photograph—it will usually be of the candid camera sort, which catches its victim in an unguarded and self-revelatory moment—has caught some trick of feature or expression which vividly reminds us of the man we knew; and it is often impossible to explain how. What the camera can bring off by a lucky accident, the artist achieves by virtue of his natural gifts. It is only through art and its images that what may be called the true feel of things can be expressed: the peculiar humor, sympathy, taste, or habit of mind of a given personality; or the atmosphere, spirit, of scene or incident—all that aura of mood and emotion which real things must stir up in us because we are men, not pure intellects. Scientific analyses have to ignore all this, and that is why they seem inadequate, dry and ineffective.

It should be clear, then, that an artist's business is to make something that, at one and the same time, will: (a) give us a significance (often of a sort that science cannot deal with); (b) give it to us in a vivid sensible form, so that it may be taken in without difficulty or delay. Works of art, and theories of art may slip into error, accordingly, by failing to observe either of these requirements: by practising or preaching an art which appeals to sense, but offers little to the mind (the common error and that to which we are devoting most space); or by exaggerating the intellectual aspect to such a degree that the result is hardly a likeness of anything, but becomes comparable to a symbol in algebra: a sensible sign, but one which no one can interpret unless he is told what it is meant to stand for by the man who devised it. A certain amount of modern secular art is perhaps deficient in this latter respect: you know the kind of painting we have in mind—the now defunct Cubist school might be taken as representing the tendency—where the canvas might as well be

turned upside down, for all the meaning one can get out of it. Yet, if there were a place for footnotes in so unlearned an article as this, I would stick one in after that last remark to observe that there is nevertheless a certain truth in the claim that a good picture may be turned upside down without total loss of value. The main objective in art is to attain a meaning, not a mere likeness. In order to attain a meaning, every part of the work has to have a function, so that the total result is an intelligible design. Where this is so, we have a production comparable to a tractor or an aeroplane: even when upside down, such objects are still recognizable as organized structures having a manifest purpose.

Our thumb is on the scales here, as anybody can see: we are heavily favouring an art with something to say, rather than an art that merely looks like something familiar and gratifies our senses. This stand is not taken because of any peculiar fondness for the modernistic, but because our subject is liturgical art: the kind which exists to help draw us the spiritual world, and which can hardly do much for us in that line if it appears meaningless. Another reason for the stress on meaning is that the downright impossibility of securing good religious work, which has been the state of affairs for the past generation, has made people too easily content with any identifiable and inoffensive sort of likeness. Let the statue wear a beard and hold a couple of ponderous keys and it is St. Peter: the public does not expect anything more and is inclined to be disconcerted when confronted with anything more. So accustomed are people today to figures not worth a second glance, that a really good statue, expressive, let us say, of the characteristic faith and humility of the Apostle, might bewilder them as much as a modern automobile—to us a vivid functional design—would bewilder an earlier generation familiar only with the outline of the horse-drawn carriage. The artist, in proportion as he aims at a decisive and unmistakable meaning in his work, must make some alterations in that with which people are familiar, that is, in the natural objects which serve him as models, so that the total result may need more than a casual glance to be appreciated.

So that we may be better prepared for the little shock that the work of a good artist is likely to give us in the beginning, let us consider just what sort of departure from the ordinary

look of things he must be allowed to make, if he is to achieve the kind of image we should be demanding of him. Starting with the most obvious points, we may recall Peggy McGillicuddy on her pedestal and assure ourselves that he will have to exclude a great deal of realistic detail; he will have to select and simplify, get rid of all the non-essentials, and give us a final product in which our eye will be able to find a central purpose without distraction. No fixed rules for this sort of discriminatory process can be offered. It would be risky to say that color, for example, is a distracting and unnecessary feature in statues, and that a good painted one is an impossibility. Some of the greatest sculptors seem to have thought so, of course, but it is sufficient for our purpose simply to understand why it is they refused to tint their statues. The meaning they were pursuing was to be conveyed by a bold outline in stone, by rhythms of pose or gesture, or something of the sort; and colors, in all the variety and shades that would be necessary on the body, drapery and features of their image, would drag in a whole new art, that of painting, and give rise to a different and complex pattern that might confuse and conceal the one in which they were interested. Without going into the thing any further, probably the best answer to the color question is that a good statue does not need it and may even be ruined by it; while a poor one cannot be done much harm and may even seem a little more tolerable for a dash of cosmetic.

Too much detail in an artificial figure induces an effect of lifelessness, approaching that of stuffed creatures in a museum (what is deader than a stuffed owl?); concentration on vital features brings about an effect exactly opposite, one which finds its most revealing examples in the work of good caricaturists. But, whereas this rule, stated in these general terms, may serve well enough for secular art, it has to be made narrower still for religious work. Useless detail is always distracting and dulling; but, where the desired end is a spiritual effect, even vital aspects of the real may be distracting, if their effect on the mind is too sensuous. Man himself is unbalanced, and that endless warfare which the spirit must wage against the flesh forces the religious artist to abandon all hope of remaining neutral, of permitting himself that natural delight in natural man which may be permissible to one who has no faith in the supernatural or has not

made himself its servant. What I am trying to say is that religious art must be austere; this is a necessity from which there is no escape. Peggy on her pedestal is an impossibility for this second reason also; and many a modern representation of Our Lady, and of certain saints, approaches the same degree of impossibility. Lovely images they may be: but their charm is altogether too physical: assigned other names, they might do very well as portrait statues of noble ladies of a bygone age; there is simply nothing about them to indicate that they are intended to be Christian in spirit.

Finally, it must be pointed out that the task of an artist is not merely one of leaving out what he does not need and giving a prominent place to elements to which he would have us pay particular attention. If there were no more to it than that, we might all be painters and sculptors. True genius gets its effects by the exercise of powers more positive, as well as far more difficult to analyze. The peculiar activity of these faculties might perhaps be described as a kind of creation or—if we are determined to make the real world our basis of comparison—a kind of illuminating and harmonious distortion. Even the most serious artists make changes in the proportions of their forms with a certain end in view; an example, although again a crude one, would be the disproportionately small size of the figure of Christ in the arms of His Mother in Michelangelo's Pieta—by the sculptor's own admission a deliberate device used to secure greater pathos. It need hardly be added that in the power to make his medium truly articulate by manipulations more subtle than this, lies the true gift of the artist, inexplicable and unteachable. We must not leave this matter, however, without reminding ourselves that in this respect the artist who is serving the cause of religion once more finds himself in a special position in that he must exert more of this creative power than another. Images which are to play a role in the liturgy must reveal a beauty not dominantly sensuous or natural; a beauty which holds the eye while encouraging it to look beyond towards that higher reality which has guided the artist's imagination and caused him to mould his work as we see it before us. Obviously this will require a purposeful changing and directing of the material which must make difficult demands upon "the shaping spirit of the imagination."

It should be clear by now that the craftsman who offers us a religious work should expect to find us difficult judges. That has been the great trouble with liturgical art; the people who buy it and the people for whom it is bought have for long been too easy to satisfy. And we are now going to tackle one last distinction—perhaps the most vital of all—which should prove that the religious artist must consider his task even tougher, and his Christian audience still harder to please than anything already said might be thought to imply. This new reason, which should make us so exacting in our judgments of religious productions, is founded in the essential distinction between profane and sacred art. Some differences between the two have already been indicated in our remarks on the austerity, simplicity, and skillful distortion to bring out meaning, which liturgical work must reveal in greater measure than that which is concerned with secular themes; but the real basis for distinguishing them has so far only been hinted at. All this austerity, simplicity, and distortion may be realized in the kind of metal ornament found on the nose of a car, or in the carvings of certain moderns; and yet these works can never exert the special effect of a truly religious masterpiece. The specific attribute of religious work lies deeper.

We now have something on our hands which it is by no means easy to explain, but let us see what we can do with the aid of a couple of homely examples. When we turn the cover of one of our popular magazines there will often lie before us a very attractive sort of picture indeed. Upon a snow-white reach of table-cloth, decorated with all the fine silver, glassware and so forth that one could desire, will rest a sublime and enormous platter of baked beans, steaming enticingly, and fairly dripping with visible flavor. It's only an ad, of course: someone is trying to sell us baked beans by showing us a colored picture of them as they never are; and nobody has ever dreamed of calling such a picture a work of art. But the point of interest to us is, why not? The image reveals great technical ability: all the objects shown have been well painted; and a manifest design—intended to give unmistakable prominence to the beans—binds the whole into a unity. Why can't this be hung in the Louvre, along with all those paintings of fruit, loaves of bread and jugs of milk? Are baked beans to be debarred for no other reason than that they are legumes

of a lower social standing? The answer of course lies, not in the subject-matter, but in the way in which the artist has handled it, in the effect which he intended to exert upon the spectator.

The peculiar and paradoxical feature of a genuinely artistic image in secular art is that it tells us about something else, but never leads us to desire that something else; what we really prize is always the image itself. When a good landscape painter, for example, paints a team of horses ploughing in an autumn field, he will not lead his audience to wish they owned that team of horses and that plough they are hauling. The effect his work does have is to make those who see it wish they owned this picture. And this principle is of course borne out by the relative values we assign to good images and to their originals; so that a very large sum will sometimes be paid for a picture dealing with a subject as worthless as the garbage dump at the outskirts of a city. Everybody knows by a kind of instinct, that the business of a good artist, in a way, is like the business of a good carpenter or cobbler, to do a good job, turn out an object that is really well made, and not merely something that will lead us to spend our money and be sorry afterwards. But when we glance at the billboards, it needs only a glance to see that the artists who designed them had no intention whatever of giving us a good image, but merely aimed at persuading us that there exists something far better than this image of theirs, something we simply must possess if we have any hope of being content or of keeping up with the Jones's—whether it be a new car or a plate of those beans. Billboard art is measured by the success with which it makes us feel dissatisfied with the image and anxious, not to understand, but to get our hands on the original; true art, by the success with which it leads us to find our delight in the image itself, in the lucidity and force with which it conveys to us, not the original itself, but the significance of the original. And the title of true art is not refused to the first kind of picture merely because we have a natural dislike of being propagandized, sold something we do not need, or otherwise misled: the real point is that we have a natural awareness that the image is a means of knowledge and immediately recognize one that fails in this function.

But, dear me, what have I been saying, that the good artist will always lead us to prize his work in itself, never that which

is reflected in it? What if a religious artist made that his aim? It's only too easy to steal things out of churches: might we not find ourselves obliged to hire guards for all our liturgical objects, just as they do in museums? And how are you going to pray satisfactorily before a statue, if you are all taken up with the beauty of the thing, and the skill and power with which it has been made, so that you wish you could take it home with you? No reply can be made to this objection in the sense of an explanation of just how sacred art can overcome the very real difficulty expressed in it, but that the difficulty must be overcome, and that good artists have often done it, is certain. Somehow or other the religious artist must succeed, not only in keeping himself out of the way, but in keeping even his work out of the way. He must produce a form that will deserve to be called a true image and yet which will lead the spectator to think of its original as alone to be esteemed. Of course, the subject in this case is of a spiritual nature—in the last analysis always some aspect of the Divine Life—so that if an audience with genuine faith is given any notion of it by his work, they will feel almost compelled to close their eyes to the image and to strive towards that of which it speaks. Yet, since this effect must be obtained without resorting to the methods of the commercial poster, and under the other special requirements which our discussion has already led us to impose upon the religious artist, it is clear that he has something of an assignment.

My friend, the pastor, would halt me now, before I began to compose my own sort of conclusion, and tell me to stop lecturing and describe in plain English just what sort of statue he ought to be trying to find. To do anything like that in detail, to give precise rules for the making of a work of art, is, of course, quite impossible even for artists themselves. Nevertheless, it may be useful to reduce all that has been said to a few final sentences. Let us agree that, if we have any hope of fostering true religious understanding and devotion, and not the idle amusement aroused by a close mimicry of the real, or the violent, short-lived emotion aroused by the pathetic or frightening images of the films, we must try to find pictures or statues with the following general attributes: First, they must be neither too realistic nor too sensuous—no attempt to make them "look alive"—and no glass eyes; second,

they must reveal a meaning, not be mere dull likenesses of human beings only identifiable by some conventional pose or symbol; third, their effect should be, not merely to give aesthetic pleasure, but to raise the mind and heart to God. That last point deserves more emphasis than we have given it. If the statue makes you want to own it, rather than makes you want to pray, it may be good art, but it is not good religious art.

It may be thought that such works as have been just described are simply not to be had. It is true we could never get them so long as we remained docile victims of the great church goods companies; nor so long as the phrase "imported marble" aroused shivers of veneration, and worth was measured by cost in dollars. But this is a blast at an enemy who has been pretty well chased from the field already (although heaven knows he is leaving us with many a fearsome memorial of his long and despotic sway). A short journey through the northeastern states, or a visit to certain churches in the province of Quebec, will convince the traveller that a new and brighter day for liturgical art has long since dawned, at least in some parishes. The work of the French-Canadian woodcarvers and of several young American artists is now receiving the esteem it deserves. The great liturgical revival which, with the earnest encouragement of the Holy Father, is steadily spreading through the Church, has already begun to draw the arts into its service; and we may look forward to a time when the prayer of the Christian people will find in sacred images an expression and a support comparable in beauty and effectiveness to that provided by the ancient ceremonial and music of the Mass itself.

ANTHONY DURAND

St. Peter's Seminary
London, Ont., Canada

THE MEANING OF THE CHURCH'S NECESSITY FOR SALVATION

Part II

An examination of ecclesiological writings which have appeared since the time of the Vatican Council reveals a wide variety of statements and explanations of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation proposed by Catholic authors. Even the brief report carried in the first installment of the present article which was published in last month's issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*[1] should suffice to indicate that there have been more divergent views about this teaching than about most of the theses treated in scholastic theology. It will be the purpose of this installment to recapitulate the various views on this subject, and then to investigate briefly the factors in the history of our theology which have tended to encourage certain less acceptable interpretations of the Catholic dogma that no one at all can be saved outside the Catholic Church.

At the very outset, however, there is one point which must be made perfectly clear. The existence of a great number of divergent and sometimes faulty explanations of this thesis in Catholic literature in no way indicates that the content of scholastic theology as such is inaccurate or even inadequate in this particular department. Actually both the tradition of Catholic theology and a definitely preponderant number of scholastic theologians explain the doctrine on the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation in a correct and satisfactory manner. Those who have given faulty instruction on this point, and who have thus been reproved by the Holy Father as tending to "reduce to an empty formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation," are precisely the individuals who have neglected or opposed the manifest statements of scholastic theology in this regard.

The writings examined in the first installment of this article show some explanations of the doctrine which are obviously faulty and unacceptable. They likewise show one approach to the teach-

[1] *AER*, CXXIV, 2 (Feb., 1951), 124 ff.

ing which is ineffective and confusing at best, and two others that can be and have been the bases for accurate and clear expositions of this body of truth. We can distinguish seven faulty presentations of the material.

1) An explanation which contains or involves a contradiction to the assertion that no one is saved outside the Church.

2) The teaching that the necessity of the Church for salvation admits of exceptions, or that the Church is, for adults at least, merely the "ordinary" or "normal" way of salvation.

3) The doctrine that the Church requisite for salvation is an invisible group, in any way distinct from the visible society over which the Roman Bishop presides as the acknowledged Vicar of Christ on earth.

4) The statement that the *ecclesia* envisaged in the formula *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is primarily or only the Church Triumphant.

5) The assertion that the Catholic Church is necessary for adults merely with the necessity of precept.

6) A presentation which limits the meaning of the Church's necessity to an acknowledgment of the fact that the supernatural gifts through which men are saved actually belong to the Church.

7) An interpretation involving the over-extension of the concept of membership in the Church or of "belonging to" the Church in such a way that the union with the Church required for salvation would be represented as something found in practically all non-members of the Church apart from any real steps or efforts on their part towards the Church and away from religious conditions or societies opposed to it.

Despite the fact that many reputable theologians employed it in the past, the use of the terms "body" and "soul" of the Church in explaining the Church's necessity for eternal salvation proved ultimately to be unacceptable. Thus, recent theologians have noted, with Dublanchy, in his article "Église" in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, that the official documents of the Church universal never used this particular terminology in discussing or explaining the necessity of the Church.[2] This "body" and "soul" terminology is metaphorical. When it is applied to the question of the necessity of the Church, it is taken out of the context in

[2] Cf. *DTC*, IV, 2166.

which it was first employed, and within which it was acceptably effective, and made to serve a purpose it was never meant to accomplish.

This terminology has proved to be unfortunate for this thesis principally because of the many meanings which have been attached at various times to both of the terms involved. Thus, some of the books which attempt to explain the Church's necessity in terms of the "body" and the "soul" of the Church, designate the visible Church itself as the "body." Others again apply this expression to the external bond or force of union within the Church, while still others apply it to all the visible elements in the Church, including the organization itself.

There is even more difficulty involved with the term "soul" of the Church. In ecclesiology this word is legitimately employed to designate the Holy Ghost, because of the function He fulfills within the Church. It is also applied, however, to sanctifying grace, to the inward or invisible bond of unity within the Church, and to an imaginary "invisible" Church of all men who have the faith, who have charity, or who possess good will. Thus by reason of the tremendous variety of meanings attached to these terms, any explanation of the thesis which depends upon them must be completed finally in non-metaphorical language to avoid misunderstanding and ambiguity. An explanation really dependent upon these terms has no enlightening value whatsoever. It is useless to assert that the "body" of the Church is necessary in one way and the "soul" of the same society in another, when no one can be quite certain, without further explanation, as to exactly what is meant by either expression.

All too frequently the meaning behind one of these metaphors is such as to render any explanation constructed in function of that meaning utterly inadequate. Such, for instance, is the case where the "soul" of the Church is depicted as some fancied invisible society of the just, distinct in one way or another from the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ in this world. At other times the confusion of the terminology leads otherwise magnificently competent authors into ineptitudes and inaccuracies into which they would never have fallen otherwise. As an example of this, we may point to the statement of Dieckmann, one of the best of the ecclesiologists, excluding any interpretation of the formula

"*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" which teaches that there is "no grace, and no holiness and salvation given outside the *body* of the Church."[3] On the same page Dieckmann makes the term "body" of the Church synonymous with the "visible religious society," and thus equivalent to the visible Church itself. Hence the use of this inept metaphor leads him to equate the necessity of this religious society for grace with its necessity for salvation, and it brings him, in the last analysis, to deny in this statement the very truth he explains so well in the main body of his thesis.

Even where such gross mistakes are avoided, however, the use of the metaphors "body" and "soul" of the Church in an explanation of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation tends to shift the emphasis from the center of the problem itself, and thereby to cause considerable confusion in the study of this thesis. What is meant to be demonstrated and explained in this particular chapter of sacred theology is the necessity of the visible Church of Jesus Christ for the attainment of the Beatific Vision. There is no question here about the necessity of the indwelling of God the Holy Ghost for the gaining of eternal salvation. Neither is there any question about the connection of that indwelling with the visible Church of God. The same things hold true about sanctifying grace, the theological virtues, and the rest of the supernatural organism accompanying sanctifying grace. It only confuses the picture when we speak of the necessity of these realities when we pretend to explain the necessity of the Catholic Church itself.

The accurate and basically adequate approach to a proper theological explanation of the thesis on the necessity of the Church states that, in order to be saved, man must be joined to the visible Church either visibly or invisibly (to use the terminology of Lens and Sylvius), or it employs the expressions that have been traditional in scholastic theology since the days of Stapleton and St. Robert Bellarmine and teaches that, in order to obtain salvation, a man must belong to the Church *in re* or *in voto*. Even within either of these frameworks, however, serious misinterpretation is possible.

The *in re* and *in voto* terminology is correctly employed when the explanation couched in it takes cognizance of all the pertinent

[3] *De ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder, 1925), II, 253.

declarations of the Church's *magisterium*, together with the rest of the datum of positive theology, and when it is made in harmony with the certain Catholic teaching about the other supernatural factors which are requisite for eternal salvation. Likewise it must take cognizance of the basic truths of missiology. Any explanation must be considered as inaccurate when it depicts the salutary *votum* of the Church as so widespread among the children of men that the labors of the Church's missioners appear to be directed merely toward bringing merely more normal or ordinary means of salvation, rather than the means of salvation themselves, to people who have hitherto not heard the preaching of Our Lord's message.

The many faulty presentations of the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation have a definite background in theological history. First of all, this thesis is so bound up with the fundamental teaching on the nature of the Church itself that any misunderstanding about one of these doctrines inevitably brings about an erroneous grasp of the other. Moreover, as it stands now in the body of scholastic ecclesiology, the thesis on the necessity of the Church is not the development of the doctrine on this subject in the works of the older theologians, but rather the continuation of what was basically only a group of answers to certain objections inserted into the treatises of the great controversialists of the late sixteenth century. Finally there have been many transmutations in the meanings attached to the terms "body" and "soul" of the Church from the time of St. Robert until the early part of the nineteenth century.

These are factors which definitely must be taken into consideration if we are to gain anything like an adequate understanding of the thesis as it has hitherto appeared in Catholic literature. The first, and the most important, is the intimate connection between this teaching and the basic concept of the Church itself.

The immediate background of all the misconceptions about the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation is inevitably an imperfect notion of the Church's own nature. Actually, a failure to realize that the visible Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ necessarily involves some misconception about the necessity of the Catholic Church for man's eternal salvation. It could not possibly be otherwise.

A man who lays any claim to the name of Catholic is bound to hold that no person can be saved other than through and in Our Lord Jesus Christ. He is also bound to think of that company or of that group within which men are saved as the true Mystical Body of Christ. In the event that he imagines the visible Church of the Roman communion to be something in any way distinct from this Mystical Body, he automatically takes it to be something not strictly necessary for salvation.

Our Holy Father reminds us in the *Humani generis* of the close interrelations between these two errors. The only mistakes about the nature and the constitution of the Church listed by him among the *venenosi fructus* which he describes as coming forth from the basic contemporary errors reproved in this encyclical are the one about the identity of the visible Catholic Church as Our Lord's Mystical Body and the one about the necessity of the Church for salvation. These are his words.

> Certain people consider themselves not bound by the doctrine explained in our encyclical letter of a few years ago and based on the sources of revelation, [the doctrine] which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to an empty formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.[4]

Thus the *Humani generis* reminds us of the existence in our time of individuals who refuse to go the whole way in accepting God's revealed teaching about the nature and the constitution of His *ecclesia* of the New Testament. Just as, long ago, there were people who were scandalized by Our Lord's humanity, and who were unwilling to believe that One who had labored and perspired, who had tasted suffering, humiliation and death, could actually be a Divine Person in the strict sense of the term, so there are today certain individuals who are scandalized by the visibility of the Church, with its good and bad members, and with its history that tells of scandals as well as of sanctity. These people cannot bring themselves to admit that this visible institution is actually God's kingdom on earth. It is precisely this attitude that causes them to indulge in a serious minimizing of the Catholic thesis on the necessity of the Church for salvation.

[4] NCWC edition (Washington, 1950), n. 27, p. 12.

This thesis, it must be remembered, has had a somewhat peculiar history in the literature of scholastic theology, a history which has, to a certain extent, opened the way for some extravagant interpretations of this part of ecclesiology. The *tractatus de ecclesia* came into existence as a distinct section of scholastic theology long after most of the other parts of this discipline were quite well developed. The thesis on the necessity of the Church for salvation, however, had acquired a relatively high state of scientific perfection by the middle of the fifteenth century. The immediate and pressing preoccupations of the Counter-Reformation writers were such as to prevent any continuation of the development of the thesis along the line of its earlier advances. When finally a greater enlargement of this thesis came about in the post-Reformation period, it came as the development of a group of answers to objections, and not as progress along the line of the pre-Reformation treatment of the thesis. Ultimately this enlargement or progress considered the question from the point of view of the minimum in the way of attachment to the Church that could be considered as sufficient for salvation, rather than in line with a study of the conditions which divine revelation ascribes to salvation itself, conditions which indicate the living and visible Church of Jesus Christ as involved in the necessary *terminus ad quem* of the process of supernatural salvation.

In order to understand this fact, we must remember that the *tractatus de ecclesia* was, with the single exception of apologetics, the last portion of scholastic theology to evolve into anything like a mature status. Thus we find, astonishingly enough, that the nearest thing to a complete treatise on the Church in all the extensive works of St. Thomas Aquinas is to be found in the couple of pages he devotes to the article on the Church in his commentary on the Apostles' Creed. Despite the fact that authors like Moneta of Cremona, Alvarez Pelayo, and Thomas Netter of Walden devoted rather considerable attention to the constitution and the properties of the Church in their polemical works, and despite the appearance during the first decade of the fourteenth century of James of Viterbo's *De regimine christiano*, a book designated by Arquillière as *Le plus ancien traité de l'église*, the first work which stands as a full-sized theological exposition of the Church is the John Cardinal de Turrecremata's *Summa de ecclesia*.

Turrecremata's masterpiece had a distinctly polemical orientation. Written in mid-fifteenth century and printed for the first time in Cologne in 1480, the *Summa de ecclesia* was directed against *pestilentes quidam homines, spiritu ambitionis inflati*,[5] the members of the anti-papal faction at the Council of Basle. Despite its controversial orientation, however, the book contained a relatively complete and quite objective statement of the basic characteristics of the Catholic Church.

The *Summa de ecclesia* gives an early and careful consideration to what Turrecremata calls "the pernicious error of those men who, animated by evil sentiments towards the dignity of the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church and the sacrament of its inseparable unity, presume to declare that anyone can be saved in his own sect outside this holy Church."[6] He declares this teaching to be "not only false or erroneous, but also heretical."[7] He expressly teaches that the contradictory of this heretical doctrine can be demonstrated in many ways, but he professes himself as content, in this instance, to base his own arguments on what the Scriptures teach about the virtue of faith, "since the unity of the holy Catholic and apostolic Church springs primarily from the unity of faith."[8] The chapter containing this material contains no less than seven distinct proofs or demonstrations of the Church's necessity based on the divine teaching about that faith which is a basic bond of unity within the Church.

In following this procedure, John de Turrecremata was contributing to and developing a theological tradition accepted by St. Thomas Aquinas himself. Commenting on the Fourth Lateran Council's words, "There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved," the Angelic Doctor writes that "the Church's unity exists primarily for the unity of the faith, for the Church is nothing but the congregation of the faithful. And, because without faith it is impossible to please God, it follows that there is no opportunity for salvation outside the Church."[9]

[5] *Summa de ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), p. 1r.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 23v.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] *In decretalem I expositio ad Archidiaconum Tridentinum.* This work is numbered 23 in the old Roman edition and 31 in the edition of Mandonnet. The passage is found in the Mandonnet edition (Paris: Lethielleux, 1927), IV, 338.

Had the tragedy of the Reformation never come to pass, it seems entirely probable that subsequent theologians would have gone on to cultivate this tradition which St. Thomas had accepted and which John de Turrecremata had so magnificently enriched. Pressing practical considerations, however, brought the great Catholic writers of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries to adopt an entirely different course. These men were primarily controversialists. And, whether they were, for all intents and purposes, pamphleteers, like James Latomus and Michael Vehe, or writers of profound theological texts like John Driedo, Thomas Stapleton, and St. Robert Bellarmine, they were concerned primarily only with those portions of Catholic teaching which had been denied and attacked by the enemies of the Church.

It so happened that the doctrine on the necessity of the true Church for the attainment of eternal salvation was not one of the theses so denied and attacked. The original Protestant writers were just as anxious to defend this teaching as were the Catholic theologians themselves. The question at issue between the two groups was this: which is actually the true Church outside of which there is no possibility of salvation? John Driedo actually considered this question as the perpetual and fundamental point of issue between Catholic theologians and their non-Catholic antagonists. He tells us that "first of all we must realize that there is an old controversy between the heretics and the true Christians as to where and among whom the true Church of Christ exists."[10]

Because it was not a controverted point, the great theologians of this period, who, incidentally, contributed most effectively to the formation of the theological *tractatus de ecclesia*, did not take the trouble to develop the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation to any considerable degree. Where this teaching appears in their writings, it serves merely to fill out and to integrate and to complete the basic notion of the true Church of Jesus Christ, the notion which these writers are showing to be objectively identical with that of the visible Church of the Roman communion.

It was only when the question of actual membership in the true Church began to be disputed among the Catholic theologians themselves that the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation began to play an important role in theological literature again.

[10] *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus* (Louvain, 1530), p. 503.

The men who first gave any extensive treatment to the question of the men and women who actually were parts or members of this society which is truly the supernatural kingdom of God on earth were faced with the problem of showing how catechumens, whom most of them refused to recognize as actual members, could achieve salvation.

Melchior Cano led the way in this direction with his somewhat involved explanation of how a catechumen could be considered as a member of the Church. He took cognizance of two distinct definitions of the true Church, one of which applies to all those united in faith to Christ both before and after the Incarnation, while the other is restricted to the Church militant of the New Testament. Cano believed that the first of these definitions designated the Church in function of faith itself, and that the second describes it in terms of the baptismal profession of faith. Hence it was his contention that in the first sense "catechumens are most true members of the Church."[11] They are not, however, members of the Church considered according to its second meaning or definition.

It is a manifest imperfection in Cano's writing on this subject that he expresses himself in such a way as to give the impression that the reality designated by the general definition of the Church militant is today something distinct from the visible Catholic Church, the society described by the second of his two formulae. However, despite what St. Robert Bellarmine and Dublanchy say, Cano did not actually use this teaching to explain the possibility of salvation for the catechumen.[12]

Francis Suarez, however, adopted the thesis which had previously been taught by Alphonsus a Castro and stated that catechumens were actually members of the Church if they possessed the virtue of divine faith.[13] Thus Suarez tended to make membership in the Church requisite for salvation, since he believed that

[11] Cf. *De locis theologicis*, Lib. IV, cap. 2. In the *Opera omnia* (Rome: Filiziani, 1900), I, 201.

[12] Cf. St. Robert, *De ecclesia militante*, cap. 3, in *De controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (Cologne, 1619), II, 110; Dublanchy, *DTC*, IV, 2163.

[13] Cf. Suarez, *Tractatus de fide*, disp. 9, sect. 1, in the *Opus de triplici virtute theologica* (Lyons, 1621), p. 160; Alphonsus a Castro, *De iusta haereticorum punitione*, Lib. I, cap. 8, in the *Opera Alphonsi a Castro* (Paris, 1571), col. 1096 f.

the possession of true inward faith constituted a man as a member of this society. Lens, who was afterwards followed by Sylvius, taught that a catechumen who had the faith and who intended to enter the Church, but who died before he could actually receive the sacrament of baptism, was invisibly integrated into the visible Church just before his death so that he might be "within" the Church and thus be saved.[14] Although this particular explanation never had any great effect in theological history, the terminology of an invisible appurtenance to the visible Church was destined to reappear in the late nineteenth century in the writing of Cardinal Franzelin,[15] and thus to play an important part in modern theological history.

Thomas Stapleton and St. Robert Bellarmine both brought the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation into their writings as a part of an objection directed against their own teachings on qualifications for membership in the Church. Both answered the problem in substantially the same way. The catechumen, or the repentant heretic, schismatic, or excommunicated person, dying before he has had the opportunity to obtain (or to re-obtain) actual membership in the Church, may be saved by the fact that he is within this society by a *votum*, by desire or intention.[16] Stapleton, and St. Robert after him, simply took the terminology traditionally employed to explain the possibility of salvation for a man who has not actually received the sacrament of baptism, and applied it to the similar case of the Catholic Church itself.

The terminology employed by Stapleton and by St. Robert was destined to become the standard mode of expression in this particular section of scholastic theology. Practically every modern treatise on the necessity of the Catholic Church employs this terminology in one way or another. In one form it has even entered into the most important modern pontifical pronouncement on the Church, the present Holy Father's *Mystici Corporis*. This en-

[14] Cf. Sylvius, *Libri sex de praecipuis fidei nostrae controversiis cum nostris haereticis*; Lib. III, q. 1, a. 3, in the *Opera Francisci Sylvii* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 238. John Lens (or Lensaeus), the theologian whose explanation Sylvius adopted here, was a Louvain teacher who died in 1593. His *De una Christi in terris ecclesia* was the source used by Sylvius.

[15] Cf. Franzelin's *Theses de ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887), p. 424.

[16] Cf. Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (Paris, 1579), p. 314; St. Robert, *loc. cit.*

cyclical urges non-members of the Catholic Church to take advantage of the divine graces so freely offered them and "to take care to remove themselves from that status in which they cannot be secure about their own salvation." It goes on to insist that these people, "even when they are referred to the Redeemer's Mystical Body by a kind of unconscious desire and intention *(inscio quodam desiderio ac voto)*" are still deprived of tremendous spiritual gifts which they can only enjoy within the Church as members of this society.[17] The context makes it clear that the Holy Father has used the terminology of Stapleton and of St. Robert as they themselves employed it, and has taught that, strictly speaking, the *votum* or intention of becoming a member of the Church brings a man "within" this society to an extent sufficient to allow for his salvation, in the event that the intention persists and that it is impossible to succeed in achieving actual membership.

It was, nevertheless, definitely a misfortune that the section on the necessity of the true Church for salvation entered into the fabric of modern scholastic ecclesiology essentially as a development of the responses formulated by men like Stapleton and St. Robert to objections raised against their teachings on the visibility of the true Church. These men and their immediate successors, outstanding theologians like Francis Suarez, Gregory of Valentia, Adam Tanner, John Wiggers, and Francis Sylvius, were primarily interested in showing that the visible Church of the Roman communion is actually the true supernatural kingdom of God on earth. They were concerned with explaining membership of the true *ecclesia,* and with pointing out the fact that these members are the parts of a visible society rather than individuals set apart from their fellows by reason of some hidden gift from God. All of them considered the teaching on the necessity of the Church with reference to this, their central objective. They were at pains to show that the essential visibility of the Church did not in any way void the Catholic teaching to the effect that catechumens could be saved.

Thus they looked primarily for the minimum of attachment to the Church which could suffice for salvation. And their successors, down to the present day, have continued to develop the thesis

[17] *AAS,* XXV (July 20, 1943), 243.

along this line. Not all of them have had the good fortune to express themselves as accurately on this question as did the theological giants of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries. As a group, however, they have limited themselves to the same objective. Instead of trying to show, from the datum of divine public revelation, that the Church of Jesus Christ is actually involved in the process of salvation, and instead of explaining how it is so involved, they have contented themselves with what is, in the final analysis, nothing more than a continuation of the great controversialists' demonstrations that catechumens who die before they can receive baptism are not necessarily cut off from salvation by the fact that they have never achieved actual membership in the true Church of Christ.

Such is the highly important, but perhaps far too little appreciated, historical background to the comparative weakness and inadequacy of the thesis on the necessity of the Church as this thesis is found in some recent Catholic writings. Precisely because theologians have been accustomed to concentrate on the minimum aspect of the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation, emphasizing the fact that actual membership in the Church is not absolutely necessary rather than stressing the vital truth that the Church itself is absolutely requisite, there has been an opportunity for the men who have chosen, in the words of the Holy Father, to "reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation."

There is still another historical factor which has contributed to the type of misinterpretation of the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation which the Holy Father deplores in the *Humani generis*. This has been the tragic misappropriation of St. Robert Bellarmine's terminology on the body and the soul of the Church for use in explaining the Church's necessity.

St. Robert made use of the terms "body" and "soul" with reference to the Church several times in the course of his book *De ecclesia militante*. First of all he designated the Church itself as a body, quoting what he took to be the sense of a passage in St. Augustine's anti-Donatist writings. Then, in the very same passage, he applied the term "body" to what his predecessors had ascertained to be the visible bond of unity within the true Church militant of the New Testament. It was St. Robert's contention

that "We must take cognizance of what Augustine teaches in his *Breviculus collationis* in the account of the conference of the third day, that the Church is a living body in which there is a soul and a body, and that the internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity, and the rest, are the soul, while the external profession of faith and the communication of the sacraments are the body."[18]

Later in the same book, he again made use of the same expressions, assigning a different meaning to them this time, although he still referred them to the same place in the *Breviculus collationis*. He understood St. Augustine to mean, in the famous passage about the *homo interior* and the *homo exterior*, that "good men belong to the Church in one way, and evil men in another, so that the good are the interior part and as it were the soul (*quasi anima*) of the Church while the evil men are the outward part and as it were the body."[19]

This designation of good and unworthy Catholics by the figurative expressions "body" and "soul" of the Catholic Church was not destined to have any important effect upon the history of scholastic ecclesiology. The application of the term "body" to the Church itself had long been a commonplace in Catholic writing, and the fact that St. Robert followed this custom had no particular repercussions in subsequent theological teaching. The application of the word "body" to the visible bond of Church unity and the designation of the corresponding invisible or spiritual bond by the word "soul" opened the way to one of the most curious and interesting chapters in the history of Catholic thought.

The very fact that he employed the same figurative words to indicate distinct realities shows what little importance St. Robert attached to the expressions themselves. Thus the question: "What is the body of the Church, as distinct from its soul?" would have had no meaning whatsoever for him. Both "body" and "soul" were metaphorical terms which he employed in various ways in different parts of his work in the process of bringing out what was to him the one central truth at issue in this book: the fact that the *ecclesia Christi* of the New Testament, the group within which alone men may find association with Our Lord, is a visible and organized society, the fraternity over which the Bishop of Rome presides visibly as Christ's Vicar.

[18] St. Robert, *op. cit.*, cap. 2, col. 109.

[19] *Ibid.*, cap. 9, col. 132.

That was the central point of the ecclesiological controversy against the heretics. St. Robert's Protestant opponents were as willing as he was to acknowledge that there was in this world such a thing as a true *ecclesia Christi* within which alone man's eternal and supernatural salvation is to be found. They differed from him and from all the other defenders of Catholic truth in holding that this *ecclesia* was not a society in the real sense of the term at all. They maintained that essentially this was nothing more or less than the sum-total of all the individuals in the world who were equipped with the requisite spiritual gifts. St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante* is, in effect, a long and brilliant theological demonstration of the fact that the religious society over which the Sovereign Pontiff presides is and will always remain the only *ecclesia Christi* on earth, and that consequently there is no such thing as an invisible *ecclesia* among men.

The astounding popularity of St. Robert's *Controversies* made it inevitable that his ecclesiological teachings would be set forth in shorter and more popular form by writers less competent than himself. One of these, the Cambrai theologian John Polman, made the first move in what was to be the twisting of St. Robert's own terminology into the expression of a meaning utterly opposed to what St. Robert himself had taught when he first employed that terminology. And, where St. Robert had used the terms "body" and "soul" with reference to the Church merely as rather incidental aids in building up an explanation of his central definition of the Church, Polman, in his immensely popular *Breviarium theologicum*, duly followed St. Robert in his definition of the Church itself, and then proceeded to define the "body" and "soul" of the Church, referring these entities this time to Clement of Alexandria as well as to St. Augustine.

> According to Clement of Alexandria and Augustine, the Church is like an animated human body. Faith, hope, charity, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost constitute its soul. Its body is the external profession of faith, the communion of the sacraments, and the acknowledgment of the Roman Pontiff as the head. Of the soul alone are catechumens who have the intention of baptism, faith, hope, and charity. Of the body alone are occult heretics. Baptized persons in the state of grace are of the body and the soul.[20]

---

[20] *Breviarium theologicum* (Paris, 1682), p. 206.

It was an unmitigated misfortune for scholastic theology that Polman chose to deal with the "body" and the "soul" of the Church as realities which had need of explanation in their own right. In the text of St. Robert's *Controversies*, these words are manifestly figures of speech, and in the very paragraph in which he employs them in the sense afterwards copied by Polman, the great controversialist refers to people who are "of the body" and "of the soul" of the Church as being joined outwardly and inwardly to this society.

St. Robert had merely used one of his favorite illustrations in the process of explaining the Catholic position on membership in the true Church, in opposition to the teachings of the various heretics influential in his own time. Polman takes these expressions entirely out of their proper context. He leaves the impression that somehow the "body" and the "soul" of the Church are realities which must be taken into account in any study of the Church itself. Moreover, he definitely oversimplified the teaching of St. Robert, neglecting to point out that a person is joined to the Church in some measure by the Church's spiritual bond of unity even when that person has divine faith without the virtue of charity.

Dublanchy assigns to Honoratus Tournely the dubious distinction of having introduced the concept of the "soul" of the Church into the explanation of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation.[21] Actually this procedure was adopted twenty-four years before Tournely published his *Praelectiones theologicae*. It is to be bound in the *Elementa theologica* of Tournely's younger Sorbonne contemporary, Charles du Plessis d'Argentré.

Although D'Argentré followed St. Robert in designating the visible bond of unity within the Catholic Church as the "body" of this society, this designation does not form a part of what we may call the master division of his treatise. According to D'Argentré:

> We propose to deal from now on with the Church militant alone. This must be considered as a living body (*quasi vivum corpus*), which consists of Christ as the Head, the faithful as members, and faith, hope, and charity as the soul acting as the principle of spiritual life for the faithful.[22]

---

[21] Cf. *DTC*, IV, 2165.

[22] *Elementa theologica* (Paris, 1702), p. 161.

It was in line with this concept that D'Argentré set out to explain the possibility of salvation for a catechumen and for an excommunicated person. Like all the other theologians of his era, he was faced with the necessity of answering an objection against the Catholic teaching on the visibility of the Church. Whereas previous writers had taught that a man might be saved if he was "within" the Church through a sincere desire of becoming a member of it. D'Argentré had recourse to his teaching about the "soul" of the Church. He had this to say about the possibility of salvation for catechumens.

I answer that catechumens are certainly not of the body of the Church, but that still there is nothing to prevent their being of the Church according to its soul (*quoad eius animam*), if they are endowed with faith, hope, and charity. With the desire of baptism (*cum baptismi voto*) this is sufficient for salvation.[23]

Taking cognizance of the similar difficulty with regard to excommunicated persons, D'Argentré made this observation.

If, nevertheless, the excommunicated persons profess the Catholic faith, they will in some measure (*aliquatenus*) be members of the Church by reason of its soul, that is by faith, and perhaps, if the excommunication be unjust, by charity. Still, however, they are not of the body of the Church.[24]

Tournely used St. Robert's terminology in a way more opposed to its original significance than even D'Argentré.

The Church can be considered in two ways. It can be considered first according to its interior status, or according to that part which we call the soul of the Church. Thus it is the society of those who are bound together by the tie of true faith in Christ and of sincere charity. In this sense it is entirely invisible. Only the saints and the just belong to it as true and living members. Secondly it can be considered according to its exterior status, or according to the body, and in so far as it is the society of those who are joined together in the profession of the same faith and the community of the same sacraments and ecclesiastical rulers. In this sense it is certain that the Church is visible and manifest.[25]

The corresponding passage in D'Argentré made no explicit reference to any "society" of those joined together in faith and charity.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 166. [24] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[25] *Praelectiones theologicae de ecclesia Christi* (Paris, 1739), I, 234.

D'Argentré merely stated that the same Church is visible by reason of its outward bond of unity or body, and invisible by reason of its inward bond or soul.[26] His very terminology, however, implied what Tournely stated explicitly, that the people who are of the "soul" of the Church in some way constitute an invisible society.

Tournely, like D'Argentré before him, used both terminologies, the "body" and "soul" of the Church, and the appurtenance *in re* and *in voto,* in explaining the possibility of salvation for catechumens. Many followed their example. The important thing for the history of ecclesiology, however, is not the fact that the metaphors of "body" and "soul" of the Church were employed to explain a thesis in which they did not fit: it is the fact that the meanings attached to these terms continued to develop away from those which St. Robert had originally assigned to them. Kilber spoke of an "inadequate definition of the Church in terms of the body," of an "inadequate definition of the Church in terms of the soul," and of an "adequate definition" in terms of both.[27] He thus reversed the very purpose for which the metaphors had originally been introduced into the *De ecclesia militante,* the work of showing that the true Church could only be defined in function of its membership in terms of the "body." Legrand, Liebermann, and Bonal completed the devastation, and defined the "soul" of the Church as an invisible Church of people possessed of charity, the very thing which St. Robert set out to prove did not and could not exist.[28] It is interesting to note that Liebermann refers his teaching on this matter to St. Robert, the theologian whose teaching he was contradicting by this use of St. Robert's old metaphorical terminology.

This tragi-comedy of misinterpretation and misunderstanding resulted finally, in the twentieth century, in such statements as that of Paul Vigué, to the effect that "the theologians distinguish two Churches, the one visible and the other invisible, the body and soul

[26] Cf. *op. cit.,* p. 163.

[27] Cf. *Principia theologica,* in the *RR. Patrum Societatis Jesu theologia dogmatica, polemica, scholastica, et moralis praelectionibus publicis in alma Universitate Wirceburgensi accommodata* (Paris, 1880), I, 86 f.

[28] Cf. Legrand, *De ecclesia,* in Migne's *Theologiae cursus completus,* IV, 25; Liebermann, *Institutiones theologicae* (Brescia, 1831), II, 55; Bonal, *Institutiones theologicae ad usum seminariorum* (Toulouse, 1887), I, 400.

of the Church,"[29] and that of Otto Karrer that "theology has deduced the doctrine of an invisible Church of good men and women, even outside the communion of the visible Church."[30] The theologians who acted thus were men who thought that they were interpreting the teaching of St. Robert, when they were actually employing his own terminology to contradict the thesis he had upheld.

It was confusion on this point, perhaps more than any other, which occasioned most of the extravagances and errors on the subject of the Church's necessity for salvation which have been noted in recent theological history, and which have been reproved by the Holy Father in the *Humani generis*.

No advance in the understanding and the explanation of the thesis on the Catholic Church's necessity for salvation can be built upon the use of this misapplied "soul" and "body" dichotomy. Neither can such progress be based upon any such faulty teachings as that of the "invisible church." It must proceed from a more intensive study of the concepts that go into the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church. It must take cognizance of the notion of salvation and particularly of the basic idea of the Church itself. It must seek, in the light of the teaching about the essential activity of this Church, to understand how a man must be "within" this society at the moment of his death if he is to attain to the Beatific Vision.

This type of investigation will in no way supersede or contradict the standard scholastic explanation that the Church is requisite for salvation with a true necessity of means. Neither will it run counter to the teaching that actual membership in the Church is necessary with the necessity of precept. It will, however, serve to bring into sharp relief the great and beautiful truth that God, in His mercy, wills to save His children in His Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[29] Vigué, in *Ecclesia: Encyclopédie populaire des connaissances religieuses* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1933), p. 101.

[30] *Religions of Mankind*, translated by E. I. Watkin (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1938), p. 262.

Answers to Questions

THE USE OF CONFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Question 1: In a country behind the Iron Curtain a priest learns from the confession of a man who is functioning as a priest that actually this latter is not a genuine priest, but is a Communist spy, masquerading as a priest in order to do harm to the Church. May the confessor take any action to prevent the great harm that is being done by the bogus priest? In the supposition that the confessor is himself accustomed to go to confession to the pretended priest, must or may he continue to do so?

Question 2: What may or must a priest do if he learns from confession that the penitent has poisoned the wine which the priest himself is about to use for the celebration of Mass?

Answer 1: These questions, although they are classified under the general heading of the seal of confession, pertain rather to the use of knowledge gained from confession. Cappello designates the use of such knowledge as *violatio sigilli indirecta, late et minus proprie accepta (De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], II, n. 911). The Church's legislation on this matter, based on the divine law, is thus expressed in the Code: "The use of knowledge derived from confession, when it entails a hardship to the penitent, is absolutely forbidden to the confessor, even when there is no danger of revelation" (Can. 890 § 1). Even if the penitent were unaware that the confessor is using information acquired from his confession, it would still be unlawful for the confessor to use it if some hardship *(gravamen)* is thereby imposed on the penitent or some benefit is prevented from coming to him. The penitent may be unreasonable in judging as a hardship some occurrence which actually tends to his spiritual welfare, such as an action on the part of the confessor that would prevent him from committing sin; yet, even in this event the confessor is bound to abstain from such an action.

In the first case proposed above, the case of the bogus priest, the confessor's first duty on learning the state of affairs is to forbid the man to continue functioning as a priest, and to command him to abstain from all Communistic activity. However, presuming that

the confession was made *in ordine ad sacramentalem absolutionem recipiendam* (Cappello, *op. cit.*, n. 880), the confessor is bound by the law of the *sigillum* in its entirety even though the penitent will not promise to observe these conditions, and consequently is denied absolution.

Hence, if the penitent refuses to accept the terms laid down by the confessor and withdraws without absolution the confessor may do nothing toward restricting the man's activities against the Church or his pretended sacerdotal ministry. Furthermore, supposing that the real priest is accustomed to go to confession to the imposter and there is reason to believe that this latter would take it amiss if the other desisted from this practice or that discredit would be cast on the supposed integrity of the bogus priest, the genuine priest would not be permitted to discontinue his regular confessions, though he knows that the sacrament of Penance is not being conferred. He himself would be doing nothing intrinsically wrong, and there would be sufficient reason to justify his material co-operation toward the sacrilegious act of the imposter (Cf. St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1909], VI, n. 660). In such a case, however, there would surely be no obligation on the part of the real priest, in going to confession to the bogus priest, to tell all his sins; and if he has some grave sin to confess, he must submit it, if possible, to a real priest.

Answer 2: Again, we must presuppose that the confessor attempts to persuade the penitent to retract his sinful intention, and either to destroy the poisoned wine himself or to permit the priest to do so. However, if he will not consent, and accordingly departs without absolution, the question arises whether or not the priest may or must celebrate Mass, knowing that the poison is going to kill him, rather than use the information derived from confession. This is a disputed point. Some say that the priest must celebrate Mass, albeit knowing that it will result in his death, if there is danger of revealing the penitent or of displeasing him—even though this latter supposition implies an unreasonable attitude on his part. According to another opinion—the better view, it seems to us—the priest may not use the wine, thus committing suicide, an intrinsically evil act, since the obligation to abstain from using information gained in confession does not include the permission or the duty to perform an intrinsically evil action. In the words of Gury-

Ferreres: "God cannot will through the obligation of the seal what is intrinsically wrong" (Gury-Ferreres, *Casus* [Barcelona, 1903], II, n. 772). As is evident, the priest would have to manage the affair in such wise as to arouse no suspicion—for example, by dropping the cruet at the Offertory and thus spilling the wine.

THE RIGHT TO PECUNIARY OFFERINGS

Question 1: If an assistant baptizes, and the offering is given by some one other than the sponsors, must the offering be given to the pastor or may the assistant keep it?

Question 2: When may the assistant retain a part of the baptismal offering?

Question 3: Who has the right to an offering given on the occasion of the churching of a woman, the blessing of a house, or a sick call?

Answer 1: Since the pastor has a right to the offering made on the occasion of a baptism, even when another priest performs the ceremony (Can. 462, §1; 463, §3), the assistant who baptizes is bound to transmit the stipend to the pastor—at least that amount which is determined by custom or legislation—whether it has been given by a sponsor or by some other member of the baptismal party.

Answer 2: When it is certain that the amount of the offering exceeding that which custom or legislation has stipulated as the due offering is intended by those who give it for the priest who baptizes, the latter may keep this extra amount, instead of transmitting it to the pastor. It must be emphasized that this ruling does not apply to every instance in which an extra sum is given; there must be moral certainty that the excess is intended for the priest who baptizes. Fr. Ferry, in his doctoral dissertation on stole fees, thus expresses this point: "The law demands that the one who assists be *certain* that the excess was intended for him before he can retain it. The rules for determining this are the same as those used ordinarily to ascertain the *intuitu personae* of Mass stipends. The excess may be kept if it is given because of the dignity, office, poverty, etc., of the one who assists, or because of friendship or gratitude. This intention, however, is not too readily to be presumed, but must be determined either expressly or from other un-

equivocal indications" (W. A. Ferry, *Stole Fees* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1930], p. 57).

Answer 3: The functions reserved to pastors by common law are listed in Canon 462, though custom can add other functions. With reference to these functions Fr. Ferry states: "These functions are called parochial functions in contradistinction to those which are merely sacerdotal; the right to assist at the former is reserved to the pastor, while the latter may be performed by any priest. Offerings made at these functions are distinguished in the same way; those made at parochial functions are strictly parochial offerings and belong to the pastor; those made at merely sacerdotal functions belong to the priest who assists at the function" (Ferry, *op. cit.*, p. 40). Applying this norm to the present question, and referring to the list of parochial functions found in Canon 462, we conclude that offerings given on the occasion of the blessing of homes on Holy Saturday (or on a day established by custom for the liturgical blessing of homes), or on the occasion of the administration to parishioners of Viaticum or Extreme Unction, or on the occasion of Holy Communion *publicly* brought to the sick, are to be given to the pastor. In the event of an amount exceeding the stipulated sum (if there be such) the rule given above in answer to the second question is to be followed. But offerings given on the occasion of the simple blessing of a home, the churching of a woman or a sick call apart from the cases just mentioned may be kept by the priest who performed these sacred rites, unless custom in a particular locality has made these functions strictly parochial. Ordinarily, it would be difficult to prove that they are parochial functions, added to those enumerated by common law in Canon 462, unless the Ordinary has made a declaration to this effect. In any event, it would be wrong for a priest to demand an offering for assistance at such functions, unless legislation or custom has determined that he has a right to receive a certain sum on such occasions.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

ORATION FOR PARENTS IN REQUIEM MASS

Question: Recently in a group of priests there was a discussion about what oration to say in the Requiem Mass when one desired to remember his deceased parents. Kindly solve the problem.

Answer: The oration, *Deus, qui nos patrem et matrem honorare praecipisti,* etc., is recited by the celebrant when he wishes to remember his own parents in the Requiem Mass. However, he does not use this form if he is remembering the father and mother of another. Fr. Van der Stappen sets this forth in his excellent treatise of liturgical problems (*Sacra liturgia,* II, 272).

Fr. J O'Connell in a far more recent publication tells us that this prayer (No. 11) may be used when the celebrant wishes to remember either his own parents or the parents of other people present at his Mass. He argues that in the new editions of the Missal the word *Sacerdotis* has been omitted after the title, *pro patre et matre.* Furthermore, the prayer itself is given in the singular as well as in the plural form (*The Celebration of Mass,* I, 141).

VOTIVE MASSES

Question: Where does the priest find the Votive Masses for Christmas and the Resurrection, i.e. the mysteries of the Nativity and the Resurrection?

Answer: A Votive Mass is one which does not correspond to the office of the day, and is permitted only if the Mass bears a votive character, according to the liturgical concept. So it is that Sunday or Ferial Masses or Masses of a determined character or mystery attached to a particular day or season are never celebrated as Votive Masses. If the formularly contains no rubric, *In Missis Votivis* it is indication that such a Mass may not be celebrated as a Votive Mass. Obviously, the Mass for Christmas and Easter are of such a character that they may not be celebrated as Votive Masses.

MASS WITHOUT A SERVER

Question: In the extensive discussions recently about offering Mass without a server, I recall vaguely some change in the prayers. Kindly note these for me.

Answer: When one offers Mass without a server, the celebrant makes all the responses himself. The Sacred Congregation of Rites (No. 3368, 1) instructs the celebrant to say the Confiteor only once and to omit the words *vobis, fratres,* and *vos, fratres,* and to

recite at the end, *Misereatur nostri.* Likewise, in the response to the *Orate, fratres,* the celebrant says *de manibus meis.*

DISTRIBUTING HOLY COMMUNION

Question: What is the proper manner of uncovering the ciborium before distributing Holy Communion? There seems to be various opinions on this matter.

Answer: The authors all tell us to genuflect after opening the tabernacle door. Once the ciborium is removed and placed on the corporal there seems to be a difference of instruction. We are told to remove the veil and place it outside of the corporal. However, on this point some of the rubricians are not clear. They seem to imply this ceremony but do not mention it specifically, since they are under the impression that all priests know that only the sacred vessels are kept on the corporal. The majority of the liturgical authors tell us to retain the ciborium cover on the corporal. However, some few, like Fortescue, direct us to place the ciborium cover on the ciborium veil which is not on the corporal.

While there seems to be some justification and authority for not removing the veil and cover separately, yet it does seem more prudent to do so. There is great danger of brushing some of the Sacred Particles from the top of a full ciborium, when the veil and cover are not removed separately.

SENIORITY IN RECEIVING HOLY COMMUNION

Question: What is the correct order to be followed in distributing Holy Communion? Do nuns receive any special consideration?

Answer: Fr. Laurence O'Connell (*Book of Ceremonies,* p. 112) says that "if nuns are to receive, give them Communion before the laity, but not before the server." All of the authors consulted merely make mention of the procedure to be followed when clerics are receiving Holy Communion. The writer strongly suspects that Fr. O'Connell's statement is prompted by a sense of high reverence for these women who have consecrated their lives to the service of God rather than by any statement or regulation of a liturgical authority. Such courtesy in all of us is prompted by a deep apprecia-

tion of their closeness to the Eucharistic Lord they are about to receive.

PRAYER IN PUTTING ON CASSOCK

Question: We were taught in the seminary to say a special prayer when putting on the cassock and surplice to remind us of our clerical ordination. Is there an indulgence attached to this prayer?

Answer: The recent edition of the *Raccolta (Preces et pia opera* [1943], n. 672) informs us that those being trained in seminaries and monasteries for the priesthood, as well as clerics of every rank and order, can gain an indulgence of three hundred days every time they recite the prayer, *Indue me, Domine,* while vesting themselves with the surplice.

REQUIEM MASS PROBLEMS

Question: Is it of obligation to have the absolution after every Requiem High Mass? Also advise about candles being placed around the coffin or catafalque.

Answer: Even though the funeral Mass has not been said, the absolution is of obligation when the body is physically or morally present. However, the absolution is not obligatory on the occasion of anniversary or daily Requiem High Masses. Custom will determine procedure in this regard.

The rubric of the Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. III) says simply that the coffin is to be placed in the middle of the church "cereis accensis circa corpus." While there is no mention made of the number of candles, yet there is the indication that candles in some way should surround the corpse. The custom is to have six unbleached wax candles burning and placed three by three either along side of the coffin or in front of the first pew on the gospel and epistle sides of the church.

SOLEMN HIGH MASS RUBRIC

Question: What is the position of the celebrant at a Solemn High Mass when the deacon sings or recites the Confiteor, immediately before the communion of the faithful?

Answer: The celebrant is instructed to withdraw a little towards the gospel side of the altar with his back to the subdeacon. He faces the epistle corner and yet remains half turned towards the altar, and half towards the faithful about to receive Holy Communion. The celebrant does not genuflect before reciting the *Misereatur* but only after, immediately before saying the *Domine, non sum dignus.*

COSTUME OF DOMESTIC PRELATES

Question: Is it proper for a Right Reverend Monsignor to appear at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament or other ceremonies wearing a black cassock with purple piping and a surplice?

Answer: This cassock is commonly called the house cassock and is not the proper choir dress for a Domestic Prelate. If he wears a surplice he should put it on over the rochet. After all the rochet is a ceremonial rather than a liturgical garment. So, in the administration of the Sacraments, prelates should wear a surplice over the rochet, unless of course they are vested with alb. The black cassock is a house dress and not to be worn for liturgical ceremonies.

LEONINE PRAYERS AGAIN

Question: After having recited the prayers at the end of Mass ordered by Pope Leo XIII, does the priest make the sign of the cross, saying, "In the name of the Father," etc.?

Answer: Most authorities either evade or ignore this point. However, Dom Augustine directs that the sign of the cross is not to be made after the Leonine Prayers (*Liturgical Law*, p. 264).

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

The Nov. 4, 1950, issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* is devoted in its entirety to the acts of the papal curia dealing with the definition of the dogma of the Assumption and the corollaries of that definition. These acts include the semi-public consistory of Oct. 30, 1950,[1] in which the Supreme Pontiff addressed nearly seven hundred bishops before seeking their *vota* in reference to the definition of the dogma and at the end of which he conferred on them his Apostolic Blessing; the liturgical request for the definition of the dogma;[2] the actual definition;[3] the Apostolic Constitution, *Munificentissimus Deus,* containing the definition;[4] the exhortation of the Supreme Pontiff following the definition;[5] the encyclical epistle of May 1, 1946,[6] in which the Supreme Pontiff sought the views of the hierarchy regarding the definition of the dogma; the oration delivered by the Supreme Pontiff on Nov. 2, 1950,[7] in the presence of the assembled hierarchy; the new proper of the Mass of the Assumption authorized by a decree *Urbis et Orbis* of Oct. 31, 1950;[8] and the provision of the same decree in virtue of which there is added to the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, following the invocation, *Regina sine labe originali concepta,* the further invocation, *Regina in caelum assumpta.*[9]

The issue of the *Acta* published a week earlier contains two allocutions dealing with scholarship: one addressed to the delegates to the Third International Thomistic Convention, dated Sept. 17, 1950,[10] and the other, to the faculties and the students of French schools present before him as pilgrims, dated Sept. 21, 1950.[11] In both he emphasized the importance of his Encyclical Letter, *Humani generis,* as a guide to them in their present and future pursuit of knowledge.[12] In the former, he praised the clarity, the simplicity,

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XLII (1950), 774.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 778.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 779.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 753.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 779.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 782.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 784.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 793.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 795.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 734.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 735.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 561.

and the purity of St. Thomas' style, urging that it be followed by all the lovers of the perennial scholastic philosophy. In the latter, he insisted on the organic unity that should be characteristic of a university in spite of the numerous branches of learning which constitute it. This unity is imperative, he said, in a day when specialization is apt to produce two contrary evils; one, an intellectual isolationism that precludes the possession of general culture; the other, the development of a superficial general training that precludes precision, exactness, and expertness.

In an epistle of Aug. 16, 1950,[13] our Holy Father emphasized the special significance of the annual German Catholic Day that falls within the Holy Year. To the delegates assembled at Passau he addressed words of comfort, urging them to strengthen in themselves confidence in God's designs and to co-operate with them through their prayers, their mortifications, and their good works. He commended their deliberations in that they aimed at studying materialism and the means of overcoming it and he expressed his satisfaction with the spirit of prayer that animated their meeting. He concluded his epistle with his Apostolic Benediction.

A letter was sent by our Holy Father under date of Aug. 9, 1950,[14] to His Eminence, Pietro Cardinal Fumasoni Biondi, to manifest his interest in the Mission Congress held in Rome in September. Our Holy Father adverted to the expected effect of the Congress, namely, the intensifying of the effectiveness of the Pontifical Society for the Propagation of the Faith, of the Union of the Clergy for the Missions, of the Society of St. Peter the Apostle for the Native Clergy, and of the Holy Childhood. He insisted on the necessity of the realistic, as opposed to the romantic approach, to the prosecution of missionary enterprises and on the value of modern methods of promoting the interests of the latter. He closed the epistle with his Apostolic Benediction.

Under date of Aug. 2, 1950,[15] a congratulatory letter was sent to Most Rev. Mesrop Habozian, Titular Archbishop of Camaco and Abbot General of the Viennese Order of the Mechitarists, and

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 728. [14] *Ibid.*, p. 725. [15] *Ibid.*, p. 724.

Rt. Rev. Serapion Uluhogian, Abbot General of the Venetian Order, on the occasion of the second centenary of the death of the Founder of the Order, Peter Mechitar.

By Letters Apostolic three notable churches were raised to the rank of Minor Basilica: by Letters of Dec. 9, 1949,[16] the Church of St. Francis of Assisi at Viterbo; by those of Jan. 18, 1950,[17] the Church of St. Helena in Birchircara in the Archdiocese of Malta; and by those of March 25, 1950,[18] the Church of the Salutation of the Angel in the Diocese of Trapani.

Two Apostolic Constitutions established new Apostolic Prefectures, one established a new diocese, a fourth transferred the See of another diocese, while a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith changed the boundaries of dioceses subject to it. The Apostolic Prefecture of Tanga, in British East Africa, was established by a Constitution of Apr. 18, 1950,[19] in virtue of which it consists of a large portion of the Apostolic Vicariate of Kilimanjaro; the Apostolic Prefecture of Galápagos was established by a Constitution of May 6, 1950,[20] in territory formerly belonging to the Diocese of Guayaquil in Ecuador; the Diocese of Toluca, consisting of what was formerly the western portion of the Archdiocese of Mexico City, was established by a Constitution of June 4, 1950;[21] the See of the Diocese of Cafelandia, Brazil, was transferred to the City of Lins in virtue of a Constitution of May 27, 1950;[22] the decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was dated May 5, 1950,[23] and provided for the assignment to the Diocese of Toowoomba a portion of the territory of the Archdiocese of Brisbane.

The beatification of Blessed Maria de Mattias was proclaimed in Letters Apostolic dated Oct. 1, 1950,[24] following a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of Sept. 3, 1950,[25] authorizing this action. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation of the same date[26] accepted the miracles required for the beatification of Blessed Margaret Bourgeoys.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 714.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 716.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 717.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 705.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 707.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 711.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 709.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 740.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 719.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 741.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 742.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Apr. 21, 1950: James McGranery and John McShain, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia; and Guglielmo Santoro, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

May 27, 1950: Joseph McConville, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Commander of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

Apr. 21, 1950: Samuel Pryor Frazier, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE RECITATION OF THE BREVIARY

The Divine Office is a most efficacious means of sanctification. Certainly it is not a mere recitation of formularies or of artistically executed chants; it is not just a question of respect for certain norms, called rubrics, or for external ceremonies of worship; it is above all a matter of elevating the mind and heart to God, in unison with the blessed spirits, who certainly sing praises to God. Therefore the canonical hours should be recited "worthily, attentively, and with devotion," as we are reminded at the beginning of the Office.

Consequently the priest ought to pray with the same intention as the Redeemer, so that his voice, as it were, is the voice of the Lord who, by means of the priest, continues to implore from the most merciful Father the benefits of the Redemption. It is the very voice of the Lord with which are associated the armies of the angels and the saints in heaven and of all the faithful on earth, to render due glory to God.

—Pope Pius XII in his exhortation *Menti nostrae*, issued Sept. 23, 1950. The translation is from pp. 16 f. of the NCWC pamphlet edition.

Book Reviews

A History of Philosophy. Vol. II: Mediaeval Philosophy, Augustine to Scotus. By Frederick Copelston S.J. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950. Pp. ix+614. $4.50.

"It is not my intention to give simply a sketch or a series of impressions of mediaeval philosophy. I have endeavoured to give an intelligible and coherent account of the development of mediaeval philosophy and the phases through which it passed" (p. 8). Such is the author's intention and in the reviewer's opinion he has succeeded admirably. In large part this success is due to the use of the primary sources themselves and the skillful and expert employment of the extensive research material that has been gathered into studies in the last few decades. Equally noteworthy is the balanced blending of the progressive and chronological interpretation of the mediaeval thinkers with the individualization of them that the writings of M. Gilson have brought so much to the fore. Because of this double but well handled organization of the material it is an ideal handbook for seminarians and those beginning the study of scholastic philosophy. There is, to the reviewer's knowledge, no other book in English which can serve so well as an introduction to the sustained effort, harmony, and rich variety that is the mediaeval philosophic achievement.

A number of things in the work call for particular commendation. Among these ought to be mentioned the extensive treatment of Augustine's philosophical thought as well as the way in which it has been organized. Worthy of mention also is manner in which St. Anselm is treated in terms of his own historical context rather than that of the thirteenth century, particularly with regard to the relationship between Faith and reason. Notable too is the clear recognition and presentation of the fact that Thomism is a synthesis and not simply a more or less purified Aristotelianism. This reviewer was particularly impressed not only with the fairness of the treatment accorded to Dun Scotus but also with the clarity of the explanation of the Scotistic conceptions of the univocity of being and the famous *distinctio formalis*. Also to be remarked is the concluding chapter which synthezises the over all picture resulting from the study and at the same time offers a concise delineation of the remarkable Christian philosophic effort of which we are the heirs.

As is natural in a survey so extensive as this individual readers will feel that some things deserve fuller treatment. Thus one might very well ask for a greater emphasis on the influence of Boethius in the

Middle Ages. Again it would seem that a fuller development of the excessive rationalism of Berengar might have helped to explain the strongly conservative tone of the late eleventh and early twelfth century. Perhaps too a more detailed exposition of the relations between Dante's philosophic and political thought would better explain the eminence he confers on Siger of Brabant and Avicenna. At times, too, the author's insistence on being simply a historian seems to inhibit him from passing judgments which would seem to be rightfully in the province of the historian of philosophy. While this might be debatable in the abstract it would still seem that in a work that will have a large textbook usage judgments such as the author is obviously capable of rendering have a real and necessary place.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

"GOOD MORNING, GOOD PEOPLE." By the Rev. Hyacinth Blocker, O.F.M. Cincinnati, Ohio: St. Francis Book Shop, 1950. Pp. 341. $3.00.

"God loves a cheerful giver" (*II Cor.* 9:7). "Let their hearts be glad who seek the Lord" (*Psalm* 104:3). If we consider that religious are pre-eminently the world's "givers" and "seekers of God," then we should expect, as does the Lord, that the merriest hearts will beat in those whom He has chosen from among thousands. And yet some religious there are with souls cast down, not directly by grief and sadness, but indirectly, by a fretful preoccupation with their smallest faults, or by an annoying distraction with trifling accidentals. Religious who should be seeking and giving "with a cheerful countenance," can become, at times, wearied, worrisome, and even "jumpy."

For symptoms of this nature, it is with confidence that we recommend *"Good Morning, Good People"* by Fr. Hyacinth Blocker, O.F.M. This volume, rich in the legacy of the good St. Francis, is a robust series of nineteen closed retreat conferences, slanted especially for nuns of active orders. Fr. Hyacinth's purpose is chiefly to supplement the usual topics of the annual retreat. This he does with a fine zest, emphasizing with Francis, that all things made are good—the stars, sickness, superiors, and even schoolboys. To confirm the advice he gives, the author proffers, besides the inspired word of Holy Writ, the pithy maxims of St. Teresa of Avila, anecdotes from the Lives of the Saints, stories of lesser Franciscan saints, jewels from Tennyson and Vachel Lindsay, and even occasional lines of his own verse. Each is quoted in its place, and the quote is never strained. Indeed, the wide range of his sources helps to unify and seldom to distract.

The nineteen chapters are so many separate retreat topics, analyzed in a bright and warm atmosphere where the pressure remains pleasantly

light. It is an atmosphere first of joy, then of individuality, simplicity, and brotherhood. Especially well done are the chapters called, "Glory Road" (on Poverty), "Are You Also Queer?" (on Scrupulosity), "One Book We Must Read" (on the Passion), and "A Little Saint for a Little People" (on St. Joseph). But all nineteen are well-rounded discourses in which the author, from his frequent rhapsodies in poetry, quickly comes to grips with the particulars needed for daily religious life. Here, busy nuns of active orders will find spiritual reading, which though never profound, is interesting, instructive and stimulating.

LUKE MISSETT, C.P.

KATHOLISCHE DOGMATIK: ERSTER BAND, ERSTES HEFT, EINLEITUNG; ZWEITES HEFT, GOTT DER DREIEINIGE. By Michael Schmaus. Munich: Hochschulverlag, 1948. Pp. xii + 648.

This is a constituent part of a series which will ultimately cover the whole of theology. The popularity of the treatise may be gauged by the fact that this is its third and fourth revised edition.

The first fascicle of this volume, comprising 153 pages, forms an introduction to theology and dogma. The second fascicle (pp. 157-648) is concerned with the Triune God. Although it necessarily follows conventional lines in many respects, it has some distinctive feature of its own. After proving the existence of God, the author passes on at once to the consideration of the Trinity. Having treated all the revealed and speculative aspects of this doctrine, he deals with the fullness of life residing in God. An analysis of this plenitude leads him to a study of the structure of the divine life: the simplicity, immutability, eternity, immensity, omnipresence, truth, goodness, beauty, dignity, and sanctity of God. Thereupon he scrutinizes the intellectual and voluntative content of the divine life. With regard to God's intellect, he expounds all the phases of the divine knowledge. At this point he introduces an exposition of God's intellectual fecundity as manifested by the generation of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. In considering the fullness of God's life from the standpoint of His will, he treats of its reality and perfection, its divisions, its relation to God Himself, its fertility as shown by the procession of the Holy Spirit. Then he takes up the attitude of the divine will toward creatures: God's love for the world and created things, the problem of evil, God's mercy, justice, truthfulness, fidelity, closing with a renewed treatment of God's sanctity and power as attributes of His will.

The most striking characteristic, then, which differentiates this book from others of a similar nature is its novel logical arrangement: mak-

ing the plenitude of the divine life the heart of the treatise and showing that this life results in a multitude of inward and outward attributes of infinite magnitude. Other commendable features are: faithful adhesion to St. Thomas with consequent security of doctrine; clarity and precision of exposition; careful attention to scriptural exegesis; adequate exposition of the history of dogma; utilization of the latest papal pronouncements such as the *Mystici Corporis* and the *Divino afflante Spiritu*. In recapitulating the patristic teaching, the author rightly prefers to cite an extensive excerpt from one of the Fathers to the collection of brief quotations frequently found in text books. Especially prominent in the book is the aim of the author to relate dogma to life, without resorting to homiletics.

The author, therefore, has not just produced another text but a treatise revealing individual study and freshness of viewpoint coupled with a keen awareness of modern needs. It is a book which even the professor will consult with interest and profit.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

ROMAN COLLAR. By E. Roberts Moore. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950. Pp. 251. $3.00.

Msgr. Moore's introduction to his own book is somewhat misleading, for in it he summarizes the subsequent chapters as an answer to the question, "What does a priest do with his time?" so that "the next time you meet a priest you won't ask what he does all day. You will already have a pretty good idea."

This will be true if the priest you happen to meet has played a rather considerable role in the contemporary establishment of the Catholic Youth Organization, the Catholic sponsorship and utilization of the Boy and Girl Scout Movement; if he has served on the New York City Housing Authority for ten years, and has played a rather important part in the evolution of the Legion of Decency, and the National Youth Administration of the 30's. For it is with these aspects of his priestly career that Msgr. Moore is predominantly concerned in *Roman Collar*.

In the first five chapters, however, he outlines the usual routine of the average parish priest, and makes the story warm with anecdotes exemplifying the usual situations and general problems that confront a curate in a city parish. He reflects the happiness of a priest who has at times been able to find ways of improving the spiritual and material conditions of his parishioners, and the sorrow of a priest who at other times has found certain problems seemingly insoluble.

Of particular interest is the religio-social study he made of the parish

to which he was first assigned, the famous Church of St. Peter's, Barclay Street, New York City. Forty-eight persons, many of them specialists in their respective fields, and thirty-eight public and private agencies co-operated in making the survey. Special attention was given to the three closely related fields of health, housing, and delinquency. The results of this thorough and energetic endeavor not only helped in the immediate work within the parish, but prepared Fr. Moore for the contribution he was later to make as a member of the New York City Housing Authority.

The impression is not left, however, that a survey of a parish, no matter how thorough, is the answer to the problem of building a well-knit spiritual community. A priest must come to know his people, and the most effective way of doing this is for the priest himself to go from door to door throughout the parish, establishing a strong bond between the home and the rectory. He then laments the fact that "the tragedy of the large parish is that no such program of parish visiting is possible."

After four years as an assistant in St. Peter's, Fr. Moore was assigned by Archbishop, later Cardinal, Hayes to the Archdiocesan Office of Catholic Charities. There he served for eighteen years, from 1923 to 1941. During these years he participated in the sizable efforts, sometimes diocesan, other times national, to solve the perennial problems of youth, and the special problems created by the depression. He has passed judgment on many of these individual efforts, and has arrived at many conclusions concerning the work of organized charity in general.

Of primary interest was the Catholic Youth Organization. In this connection he lauds the emergence of the policy of employing paid social workers instead of depending exclusively on the efforts of volunteer workers; not necessarily because of the inefficiency of the latter, but simply because of the overwhelming demands made on them by an organization expanding to meet the necessities of the day.

As for his philosophy in respect to the CYO he emphasizes its role as an adjunct to parochial activity, and also stresses that the CYO is not to be conceived as serving merely athletic purposes. There is a brief *cum laude* recounting of the work of Bishop Shiel of Chicago. Msgr. Moore feels, however, that perhaps the CYO in Chicago was too centrally organized, thereby lessening its effectiveness as an auxiliary of parish life, and also endangering its permanence.

Msgr. Moore then describes the work and objectives of the Boy and Girl Scouting idea. He devotes another chapter to the Housing Authority, of which he was an original member, and not only praises the work of the Authority, but supports his views by quotations from

Quadragesimo anno. There is a brief account of the establishment of the National Youth Administration, which he stresses, is not to be confused wtih the American Youth Congress. There is also a short history of the Legion of Decency which was created by the Bishops' Committee in 1934 as an outgrowth of a suggestion made by a spokesman of the Motion Picture Industry itself.

Roman Collar, then, is the story of a man who has led an extremely active and certainly interesting life, and of a priest who never hesitated to use new methods, techniques and ideas in the service of the Church. Unfortunately the book seems to lack a certain sense of unity, the first part being almost exclusively pastoral and the second almost exclusively professional, creating a doubt as to the audience primarily intended. The latter section is interesting from the point of view of Catholic history. Many of the issues discussed have controversial aspects, involving at times even such incendiary topics as the New Deal and the New Deal philosophy.

PAUL E. MCKEEVER

Book Notes

Sheed and Ward issued an English translation of the first book of Father Maurice de la Taille's *Mysterium fidei* in 1934. The translation of the second book (theses 16-35) of this same magnificent work appeared last year. It is to be hoped that the translation of the third and final book of this classic will appear within a reasonably short time.

The translators and the publishers are to be congratulated for the honesty and intelligence they showed in giving their readers a complete translation of the original. Far too frequently on similar occasions other firms have underestimated the intellectual capacities and interests of Catholics who read English or have been overawed by the costs of printing an erudite work and have finally reduced the scholarly apparatus of their translations to a bare minimum. *The Mystery of Faith* has suffered no such indignity. Even the formidable footnotes are left intact.

Any lists of the ten most influential books of theology produced during the first half of the twentieth century would almost certainly contain the *Mysterium fidei*. It aroused particularly great interest in our own country, where one of the most interesting debates (and perhaps the most interesting debate) in the history of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* centered around this book. The principals in the discussion were Fr. De la Taille and Fr. Swaby, O.P. Bishop Alexander Macdonald sided with the author of *Mysterium fidei*.

Since we have been speaking of the ten most influential books of sacred theology written during the first half of the twentieth century, it is interesting to note that another certain member of this group has just been re-issued in English translation. It is *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, by Fr. Augustin Poulain, S.J. The appearance of this fifth reprint of the English translation is of particular interest at this time, when certain extraordinary spiritual phenomena have caused some Catholics to lose their religious perspective. Fr. Poulain's great work contains unquestioned and unquestionable descriptions of various extraordinary spiritual phenomena. It also con-